

# ARIANISM

NOT THE

*Primitive Christianity:*

OR, THE

ANTENICENE FATHERS

VINDICATED,

From the Imputation of being favourable  
to that HERESY.

Design'd as an ANSWER (in Part) to  
Mr. WHISTON'S *Primitive Christianity*  
*Reviv'd.*

---

By JOHN HANCOCKE, D.D.  
Rector of St. Margaret's Lothbury, London;  
And Chaplain to his GRACE the Duke of  
Bedford.

---

The Second Edition.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for R. HALSEY, in St. Michael's Church-  
Porch in Cornhill. 1719.

Price One Shilling.

ARRAIGNMENT

NOT THE

Prisoner's Confession:

OR, THE

A TESTIMONY FATHERS

VINDICATED,

From the Imputation of being favourable  
to that Heresy.

Devised as an ANSWER (in Part) to  
a late Westminster Conference



By JOHN HANCOCK, D.D.  
Rector of St. Paul's Church, London;  
and Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of

Devon

LONDON:

Printed for R. H. B. at the Church  
Lane in Cannon Street.  
Price One Shilling.



# THE PREFACE.

**M**R. WHISTON, every where in his Books, talks much of Original Evidence. He seems not much to value, not only what is said by all our Modern Writers of Controversy, but even ever since the Council of Nice. I have here attempted to lay before the World some Passages of the Antenicene Fathers, that seem to me to be Evidence that Arianism was not the Primitive Christianity. Whether they be so or no, neither Mr. Whiston nor I must be Judges; the World will judge for themselves. I will not say (as he does) I am sure, or that no Body will, or can, or dare Answer me: But I will say, I verily believe he has not proved his Point.

When I see such prodigious Confidence in a Writer of Controversy, I am not at all shock'd by it, but rather am apt to suspect all is not right; for Truth sure may be defended without so much Noise, and such assuming Airs, such Pretences to absolute Certainty, as they are more usual with Quacks and Mountebanks, than learned Physicians; so they may be expected from ignorant Bigots, not from learned Controvertists. If this little Paper may be, in the least, instrumental to the Defence of the establish'd Doctrine of the Church, and to preserve Peace and Unity in it, as it is the Design, so it will be the Joy of its Author.

J. H.

# THE FATHERS,

Whose TESTIMONIES are contained  
in this Book.

|                         |   |        |
|-------------------------|---|--------|
| <b>C</b> lemens Romanus | — | Pag. i |
| Polycarp                | — | 3      |
| Ignatius                | — | 4      |
| Barnabas                | — | 17     |
| Testam. Patriarch       | — | 18     |
| Iustin & Martyr         | — | 18     |
| Tatian                  | — | 24     |
| Athenagoras             | — | 25     |
| Theophilus Antiochenus  | — | 26     |
| Ireneus                 | — | 27     |
| Melito Sardenfis        | — | 30     |
| Clemens Alexandrinus    | — | 31     |
| Origen                  | — | 38     |
| Caius                   | — | 55     |
| Hippolitus              | — | 56     |
| Tertullian              | — | 59     |
| Novatian                | — | 64     |
| Greg. Thaumaturgus      | — | 68     |
| Theognostus             | — | 70     |
| Dionysius Alexand.      | — | 72     |
| Dionysius Roman.        | — | 73     |
| Council of Antioch      | — | 75     |
| Pamphilus               | — | 76     |
| St. Cyprian             | — | ibid.  |
| Peter of Alexandria     | — | 79     |
| Arnobius                | — | 80     |
| Lactantius              | — | 81     |
| Constitutions, &c.      | — | 85     |

# ARIANISM

NOT THE

## Primitive Christianity.

**D**ESIGNING to collect some Places out of the *Antenicene* Fathers, that seem plainly to prove the true and proper Divinity of *Christ*, there is no occasion I should say any thing of the Pre-existence of our Saviour before his Incarnation: 'Tis so clearly asserted by the *Antenicene* Fathers, and so fully confess'd by the *Arians*, that it is needless to prove it.

I shall therefore set my self to prove his Divinity, and I will begin with *Clemens Romanus*.

There are so few of his genuine and undoubted Works, (one Epistle to the *Corinthians* generally received, tho' rejected by *Launoy* and a Learned *Lutheran* Divine, and a Fragment of another doubted of by some) and those written on such an Occasion as did not lead him to speak of this Matter, that we are not to expect much from him.

However we may observe, that speaking of our Saviour, *Ep. 1. p. 82.* he calls him, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ Θεοῦ, *The Brightness of the Majesty of God.* And seems to take it from *Heb. 1. 3. Who being the Brightness of his Glory, &c.* ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης; a Chapter where the true and proper Divinity of *Christ* is as plainly asserted as in any Place of Scripture.

B

And,



And, P. 36. that he might persuade the *Corinthians* to that Humility that would prepare 'em for Peace and Unity among themselves, he proposes to 'em the Example of *Christ*, and tells them that our Lord *Jesus Christ*, tho' he was *σκήπτρον ἡ μεσολαβούνης Θεοῦ*, the Scepter of the Majesty of God, and might, considering the Dignity of his Person, have come in the greatest Splendor and Glory, yet he shewed his Humility, by submitting to come in a low Estate. An Expression something like that of the Apostle, Phil. 2. 6. *Who being in the Form of God, thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation, &c.* And, Pag. 72. speaking of the Privileges of *Abraham*, he says, *Of him as concerning the Flesh the Lord Jesus came.* He seems plainly to intimate that *Christ* had another Nature beside his Human, of a more Divine Original: And probably refers to *Rom. 9. 5.* where the Apostle speaking likewise of the Privileges of the *Jews*, says, *Whose are the Fathers, and of whom Christ as concerning the Flesh* (the very same Words *τὸ καὶ σὰρκα*) *came, who is over all God blessed for ever.*

In the Beginning of his second Epistle he tells them, we ought to think of *Jesus Christ* as of God, *ὡς καὶ Θεὸς*; and that we ought not, *μὴ κατὰ ἑσέως*, to think meanly of our Salvation, i. e. of our Saviour; for if we think mean things of him, we can expect to receive but mean things from him. I can see no difference between thinking of him as God, and thinking him God; and if we do not think him God (if we may believe *Clemens*) we think too meanly of him. Upon the whole it appears, that *Photius* was a little too critical, when he complains of *Clemens*, that tho' he does not any where blaspheme our Saviour, yet he does not speak of him in Terms worthy of him as God: And the anonymous Author of the *Irenicum* too bold, when he says, that *Clemens* seems scarcely to allow him to be any more than a mere Man.

## Primitive Christianity.

3

The next I shall speak of is *Polycarp*. In his Epistle to the *Philippians*, he speaks of Christ as our *All-seeing Judge*. We are, saith he, before the Eyes of our Lord and God, and we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ. Here, if he speaks of Christ, and not God the Father, as I think is clear enough, he not only calls him God, but attributes to him *Omnipresence* and *Omniscience*, essential Attributes of God.

In the Fragments of *Polycarp* by *Euseb. H. l. 4. c. 13.* we have this Doxology: *Wherefore I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee for all things, through the Eternal High Priest Jesus thy beloved Son, through whom to thee, together with him, in the Holy Ghost, be Glory now and for ever. Amen.* Here we may see there is no inconsistency between giving Glory to God through Christ, and with him; here they are both together.

This is a good Argument for the Divinity of our Saviour; for if we in giving Glory to God the Father, join the Son, and Holy Ghost, only as the most excellent Creatures, why may we not join *St. Michael* too as the most excellent Angel? or with the *Papists* say, *Glory be to God and the Virgin Mother of God?*

Tho' in the foregoing Doxology it be said *in the Holy Ghost*, yet there are others of the same *Polycarp* in another Form. *Vid. Val. Not. ad Euseb. p. 73.* We wish you, Brethren, Health in the Lord, cleaving close to the Precepts and Gospel of Jesus Christ, with whom be Glory and Honour to God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, for the Salvation of the Elect Saints. Of the same kind is that of the Companions of *Ignatius*—*Glorifying in his (i. e. Ignatius's) venerable and pious Memory, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom and with whom Glory and Power be to the Father with the Holy Ghost, in the Holy Church, for ever. Amen.*

Indeed sometimes the Doxologies run—in the Holy Ghost, which is not to be understood as our Modern Anti-trinitarians seem to do, by the help of the Holy Ghost; for that does not seem very proper, if it be Sense;

but is certainly the same with that of *Athenagoras*, ἐν ἑβδότητι πνεύματος, in the Unity of the Spirit: and in this Sense our Church in her Liturgy uses the very Expression, in the Unity of the Holy Ghost. And this is perfectly all one as to say, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.*

I now come to *Ignatius*. And since Mr. *Whiston* thinks he has got a mighty Advantage to his Cause by the Discovery he pretends to have made, that those that were by so many of the most learned Men of all Parties thought to be the interpolated, are the genuine Epistles of *Ignatius*; I shall without disputing that Point with him, shew out of both of 'em together the Divinity of *Christ*, keeping the Titles that Mr. *Whiston* has given them of the *Smaller* and *Larger Epistles*.

And seeing this Collection is designed chiefly for the use of the *English* Reader, and the Words in which the Design of the Citation lies, so few, and so commonly understood by those that have any Learning, I shall very often leave out the *Greek* Text, or at least put in only that part of it that more immediately concerns this Controversy. I make use of Mr. *Whiston's* Edition of the Epistles.

Pag. 104. Plainly speaking of our Saviour, *According to the Faith and Love which is in Christ Jesus our Saviour, being Followers of God, and stirring up our selves by the Blood of God.*

The larger Epistles have it, *the Blood of Christ*. Whether the *Arians* were more likely to interpolate the Word *Christ* for the Word *God*, or the Orthodox the Word *God* for the Word *Christ*, I dare appeal to the Judgment of any of the Learned but Mr. *W.*

*Smaller, P. 120. There is one Physician fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God incarnate, true Life in Death, both of Mary and of God. Mark, he was made as Man, not made as God, and therefore a true God incarnate, and not only as Mr. Whiston says, truly a God, that is, truly appointed a God—of Mary and of God,*



God, ἐν Μαρίας καὶ ἐν Θεῷ: As his Human Nature was of Mary, so his Divine was not only from, but of God the Father.

*Larger.* The same Passage is thus: We have a Physician, our Lord God Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son and the Word, before the World was; but afterward he became Man of the Virgin Mary, for the Word was made Flesh. Who was incorporeal in a Body, impassible in a passible Body, immortal in a mortal Body: our Lord God. Mr. W. translates it, our Lord and God, for some Reason no doubt; for there is no (καὶ, and) in the Original. Our Lord and God is much easier applicable to his Scheme of a God by Office, and our Lord God much more emphatical and expressive of Christ's real and natural Divinity.

The only begotten Son and the Word before the World was, μετὰ αἰώνων, before the Ages, or before all Ages, μετὰ πάντων αἰώνων, as it is often express'd in the Fathers, with respect to the Word or Logos. I know Mr. W. will not allow these Words to signify a proper and absolute Eternity; and I confess αἰών or αἰώνας do not always do so, but sometimes denote only a very long Space of Time, either past or to come. On the contrary Mr. W. cannot deny that αἰώνιος does sometimes signify a proper Eternity, at least à parte post. I hope he is one that does not think the ζῶν αἰώνιος, the Eternal Life of the Blessed in Heaven shall have an End, whatever he may from his Father Origen think of the Eternity of the other State. And I confess I see no reason why μετὰ αἰώνων should not here, and in other Places of the Fathers, be taken to signify Eternity à parte ante, or of Time past. I verily believe the Fathers mean the very same thing by μετὰ αἰώνων and μετὰ πάντων αἰώνων. And that they mean not only the several Ages of the World's duration, but Ages before the World was; and that the true Meaning of the Fathers is all imaginable Ages or Spaces of Time, which I am sure is the utmost we can say by the Word αἰώνας to express an absolute Eternity.

Mr.

Mr. W. asserts in his 6th Proposition, that our Saviour, as to his Divine Nature, was the λόγος *See* *αἰώνιος*, The λόγος or Word of God before all Ages; and I think I may (as truly as he has done some other Passages) turn it *the eternal Word of God.*

I cannot think the Fathers could mean any thing less than a proper Eternity by these Expressions; because if we suppose the Fathers acquainted with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, they must needs know that the very same Expressions are used concerning the Eternity of God the Father, or God when spoken of absolutely. Nothing is more common than to express the Eternity of God, by saying he was *before the World, before the Hills, or ever the Earth and the World were made*, and such like Expressions, as do not seem to carry the Duration of God so far back as the *αἰών* *αἰώνων*, of the Fathers, with Respect to the Logos. How it happens I know not; but I think no body ever yet dreamt of bringing such Expressions as an Argument against the absolute Eternity of God.

Another Reason why I think the Fathers meant a proper Eternity by these Expressions, is, because they in many Places use such Words and Expressions as are not capable of any such Restriction, and limited Signification, as sometimes the foremention'd Phrases are.

It will be easily proved in the Sequel of this Discourse, that the Fathers use the Words *αἰώνιος* and *αἰών*, concerning the Logos, or Christ's Divine Nature, which two Words, if they do not signify a proper Eternity, there is no Words, I think, in the Greek Tongue that can do it.

They likewise in a great many Places say in Words, or to this Effect, that there *never was a time when the Father was not a Father, or when the Son was not with the Father, &c.* But to return, *Who was impassible in a passible Body,* ὁ ἀπαθὴς ἐν παθητῷ σώματι. Mr. W. had best consider how this Place agrees with his Assertion, that Christ suffer'd in his Divine Nature; I think *Ignatius* here asserts his Divine Nature was *impassible* even in the *passible Body.* Who

## Primitive Christianity.

7

*Who was immortal in a mortal Body.* It hath been said by some of the Fathers, that some of the *Arians* held, that even the Divine Nature of Christ was not *absolutely immortal*, by which I suppose they meant *necessarily immortal*: But we must suppose *Ignatius*, when he joins *immortal* with *impassible*, must mean that an *absolute, necessary, and natural Immortality* is a Property of the *Logos, or Divine Nature of Christ*.

Larger, Pag. 142. *Our Lord and God Jesus Christ first did and then taught, &c.*

*Ibid.* There is nothing hid from our Lord, but our very Secrets are nigh unto him: Let us therefore do all things as become those that have God dwelling in them, that we may be his Temples, and he God in us. Mr. W. A God in us; we know what kind of God he means. Here Christ is not only call'd God, but hath one of the peculiar Properties of God, the Knowledge of the most secret things attributed to him.

These Words are the same both in the larger and smaller Epistles.

Page 148. Lesser. *For our God Jesus Christ was according to the Dispensation of God, conceived in the Womb of Mary.*

Larger. *For the Son of God who was begotten before the World was, and disposed all things according to the Will of his Father, was carried in the Womb of Mary.*

Here Christ is by the lesser Epistles plainly called our God Jesus Christ, and the Words out of the larger amount to much the same thing, if we allow that old Rule, *What is begotten of God must be God*; and that Creation and Providence are the proper Works of a truly Divine Power, peculiar to one that is truly God.

Pag. 152. Larger. *Ignorance was dissipated, and Tyrannical Authority was abolished, God appearing as Man, and Man working as God.* Here is God plainly contradistinguished from Man, and Man from God. Sure this Place can never mean only a God by Office, or a Man made a God.

Page 172. Larger. Speaking of the Ministry, who, saith he, are intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ, who



who being begotten by the Father before the World began, was God the Word, the only begotten Son, λόγος θεός, μονογενής υἱός.

I cannot but wonder sometimes to think why the Fathers should use the Word *Begetting* so many hundred times, as they do, and so very seldom (if ever) the Word *Making* or *Creating*, if *Begetting* and *Creating* were the same thing, as Mr. W. says. Or if all the Difference were that the Son was made by God ἀμεινόμενος, without the Concurrence or Help of any other, and so was not properly created, but begotten. But that which I most wonder at is, that the Fathers, till the Arian Times, tho' they talk so often of the *Generation of the Son*, and the Creation of other things, should never think of that fine Word ἀμεινόμενος, that God's begetting his Son was his making him by himself, whereas he was called the Creator, because he made nothing himself, but all things by his Son. Indeed Mr. W. (as he somewhere tells us) has a whole Score of Authors that have either used, or not disapproved the Use of the Word *Create* instead of *Beget*, with Respect to the Son. But I am afraid he is a little ashamed of em; for he (who is liberal enough of all Conscience of his Citations when there is little or no occasion, either when the Point is not to his Purpose, or his Citations not to the Point) in this that is the most to his Purpose of any thing he could prove from the Fathers, only makes References, and in effect bids us go look 'em. This likewise puts me in mind of another kind Condescension in Mr. Whiston to his Readers; who, when he comes to prove the Authority of his Constitutions from their Agreement with ancient Authors, stuffs one Column with large Citations, and leaves the other wholly empty, with only References to the Constitutions: I confess the Work of consulting is easier, because he refers us but to one Book; but I should think that wast Paper had been well employed, if he had given us the Words of the Constitutions themselves, as well as of his other Authors: For then we should have been able

to make some Judgment at first View, whether they had agreed in Expressions, or only in Doctrines; tho' if the very Words agreed, it would yet be an undetermined Question, whether the Constitutions were before the Authors, or the Authors before the Constitutions, and so very hard to be known which of them cited from the other, unless Mr. *W.* could give us more clear Evidence that the Constitutions he would prove Canonical were expressly cited by any of the Fathers of the three first Centuries, which I think he has not yet brought any one clear Place to prove. Tho' he has done what can be done, and more than any Man would do but himself; for where-ever he finds any of the Words, διαλάξεις, διδάξεις, διαλαγαί, διδαχή or διδασκαλία τῶν Ἀποστόλων, &c. all the World cannot help it, they must refer to the Constitutions. And that Book, if we believe Mr. *Whiston*, I dare say had more Titles than the Emperor, the King of *Spain*, or the Czar of *Muscovy*.

Larger, Page 176. There is a Place where Christ is call'd λόγος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀλλ' ἐσιώδης, and ἐργείας δείκνῃς ἐσία γεννέσθῃ, which I think correspond much better with the Orthodox than the *Arian* Scheme. Yet since the *Arians* do own the Logos to be ἐσιώδης substantial, and in a Sense ἐσία γεννέσθῃ a begotten Substance, making γεννέσθῃ and κτισθῇ begotten and created the same, I will not insist upon it: Tho' I verily believe the Author of this Epistle had no *Arian* Meaning in it.

And upon this Occasion I would remark that this is the Case of a great many of those Authorities that Mr. *Whiston* cites for his Opinion. If it be possible to reconcile 'em to the *Arian* Scheme, with some mere Suppositions, such as that begetting and creating are the same, that where-ever Christ is call'd God, it must be meant God by Office and Appointment, and the like, then all goes on his side, and he will press them into the Service whether they will or no, notwithstanding the Authors shew, by what they say in other Places, they had no *Arian* Meaning in 'em.

The Passage last referr'd to is thus expressed in the lesser Epistles; ——— *Being inspired by his Grace to convince the Unbelievers and disobedient, that there is one God who has manifested himself by Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Eternal Word, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος αἰδίδου, not coming forth from Silence, who in all things pleased him that sent him. If αἰώνων, before all Ages, don't signify a proper Eternity, I hope Mr. W. will not deny that αἰδίδου does, or else no Word in Greek can do it. Mr. W. is so well assur'd in his own Opinion that he has fully proved, that the larger Epistles of Ignatius are the genuine ones, that I suppose this Place, to prove the proper Eternity of the Logos, will be of little Weight with him, but it must be considerable with others, when the Generality of the greatest Criticks, and most learned Men of all Persuasions, think the smaller Epistles genuine.*

Larger, P. 186. ——— *In Christ, who was begotten by the Father before all Ages, αἰώνων αἰώνων. Of this Expression see before.*

Larger, P. 222. *The Virgin Mary did really conceive that Body which had God inhabiting in it; God the Word was really conceiv'd of the Virgin.*

Lesser, Pag. 234. ——— *The Will of him who willerh all things, which are according to the Love of Jesus Christ our God.*

Lesser, P. 242. *Our Saviour is called again, Our God Jesus Christ.*

Larger, P. 304. ——— *Being fully and really persuaded of the things concerning our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, the first born of every Creature, God the Word, the only begotten Son, according to the Will and Power of God.*

Here we see how little Mr. Whiston's Fidelity is to be depended on, when he interpolates these Words, (*according to the Will and Power of God*) which are not in the Original, but in the Lesser Epistles out of which he has transplanted them. Any thing that will serve his Turn.

Larger, P. 314. *For what does a Man profit me, if he commends me and blasphemes my Lord, not owning him to be*



be God bearing Flesh about him.— A God is always Mr Whiston's Way of translating any Place where our Saviour is call'd God. I wonder how many Gods he supposes there are. The Greek is *σαρκοφερον θεον*.

Larger, P. 346. Wait for Christ the Son of God, for him that was before, or above, or beyond Time, but appear'd in time; him that was by Nature invisible, but became visible in the Flesh, him that was impalpable and could not be touch'd, as being incorporeal; but could be touch'd, and was palpable in the Body, him that was impassible as being God, but became passible for our sakes as being Man.

*Τον αχρονον εν χρονω*, I do not think that the translating of *αχρονον* either before Time, as Mr. W. or above time, as the Bp. of L. or beyond Time, or without time, as it might be translated, reaches the Sense, I think it is equipollent to *αιδιον* or *αιωνα* Eternal.

Him that was impassible as being God, but became passible for our sakes, as being Man.

Sure Mr. Whiston's passible God, and Ignatius's impassible one, are too kind of Gods. The Truth is, Ignatius means all along, when he calls Christ God, a God that is truly and by nature God; but Mr. Whiston's passible God is no God, further than any Angel or Man, that has any Power committed to him under God may be and be called a God. I know not how Mr. W. will do with this Place, unless he will suppose the impassible God changed into a passible one.

P. 360. I wish you all Happiness in our God Jesus Christ. This Passage is in both the Smaller and Larger Epistles.

And thus I have, I think, fully proved, that neither the Larger nor Smaller Epistles of Ignatius, will at all serve Mr. Whiston's Purpose.

There are, it may be, some few Places that be equally applicable to the Orthodox or the Arian Scheme, but those are not worth our Notice; they prove nothing either Way.

There are likewise two or three Places that exhort to obey our Bishops, as Christ obey'd the Father. But

these may easily be suppos'd to mean Christ as Man, or as the Mediator betwixt God and Man. *Ignatius* might as well exhort us to Obedience as the Apostle, *Phil.* 2. 6. does to Humility, from the Example of Christ.

I confess, both the anonymous Author of the *Irenicum* and *Sandius* mention these as too mean Expressions concerning Christ, and inconsistent with his being suppos'd to be *God*, but against all Reason. It would be as absurd to infer, when Christ is in some Places call'd only the *Son of Man*, that therefore he is not *God*, as it would be when he is sometimes called the *Son of God* and *God*, that he is not the *Son of Man* and *Man*.

Now since Mr. *Whiston* pretends to prove the three Epistles that go under the Name of *Ignatius*, that to *Tarsus*, to the *Antiochians*, and to *Hero*, are genuine, contrary to the Opinion of most learned Men hitherto, I shall try whether upon that Supposition they will do him any Service to prove his *Arian* Scheme. I think they are more positive against him than the other. And first of the Epistle to *Tarsus*.

Page 363. *Wherefore (saith Ignatius) I am ready for Fire, for wild Beasts, for the Sword, for the Cross, so I may but see Christ my Saviour and my God, who died for me.*

*Ibid.* He speaks of some *Hereticks*, that asserted that Jesus Christ was *born in Appearance, and crucified in Appearance, and died in Appearance*; others, that he is not the *Son of the Creator*; others, that he is the *God over all*; others, that he is a *meer Man*.

I cite this Place because I would shew it will not serve Mr. *W's* Purpose. We see here this Author makes it equally *heretical* to say that Christ is not the *Son of the Creator*, or that he is the *God over all*, that is, the Father (or the God absolutely without any Distinction of Father and Son) or a *mere Man*.

The *Cerinthian* Hereticks held what the *Valentinians* did afterwards, that Christ was not the *Son of the Creator*, but of some inferiour *Aeons*, as *Bythus* and *Sige*.  
And

And there were in those Days some that held as the Patropassians did afterwards, that Christ was God absolutely, and therefore suffer'd only in Appearance.

Page 365. Also ye know that he that was born of a Woman is the Son of God, and he that was crucified is the first born of every Creature, and God the Word, and he made all things.

Here we see, our Saviour is the Son of God (no doubt as God) for he is God the Word *θεὸς λόγος*.

The first born of every Creature. I observe, where Mr. W. meets with these Words he puts 'em in *Italick*. I suppose he thinks they are very much for him: But if he would consider that Place, Col. 1. 15. without Prejudice, he might perhaps be of another Mind. I should think, if the Apostle had meant by the first born of every Creature the first Creature that was made, he should rather have said *ἀρχὴν τῶν κτισμάτων*, the first made of every Creature; especially when immediately (speaking of the making of other things) he changes the Word for that which properly signifies making or creating, for all things (saith he) were made by him, *ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ*; so that I doubt not but tho' the Logos with Respect to God was *ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου* the first born in the strictest Sense, yet with respect to the Creation it signifies that he is as the first born of God, the Heir of the whole Creation; nay the Author of it, the *ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως*, as it is in the Revelations, the Beginning of the Creation of God, that is, the Principle, the Cause of the Creation; not the first Creature that was made. And that the Apostle means so here I think is clear, by the Reason he gives why he calls him *ἀρχὸν τοῦ κόσμου*, &c. the first born of every Creature; for (saith he) by him were all things created, whether Things in Heaven, or Things on Earth, &c. All things were created by him and for him. Mr. W. can never persuade me, that a mere Creature can be the Creator and Preserver of all things, or that all things were made either by or for any Creature, as the Apostle here says they were by and for the Son of God. However, it is clear he here calls him



him the First-born of every Creature, because all things were made by him, and he is Heir of all things.

Here Mr. *W.* gives us a Cast of his Office of correcting and supplying the Defects of Authors; for after these Words, *And he made all things*, he puts in (I won't say interpolates) these Words [*by the Command of his Father*] which are not in the *Greek*. I thought Mr. *W.* had been making a Translation, not a Paraphrase. And if it be so easy a thing for Words to creep out of the Margin into the Text, as Mr. *Whiston* often supposes when any thing lies in his way, and he wants to strike it out for an Interpolation, 'twill be no less easy to take away two Brackets, and then the Words will grow good Text. But methinks he is a little injurious to God the Father by what he puts in. I should think God the Father could hardly be call'd the Creator, if he did nothing himself in the Creation, but only commanded his Son to do it.

Pag. 366. he shews what he meant before by *God over all*; and that he is not God over all, and the Father, but his Son, &c.

Pag. 367. *Nor is he a mere Man, through whom and by whom all things were made, &c. and not rather God the Word, and the only begotten Son.*

#### The Epistle to the *Antiochians*.

Pag. 373. he cautions them to reject all the *Errors of the Jews and Gentiles*, and neither to introduce a *Multitude of Gods*, nor to deny Christ under pretence of the *Unity of God*. To deny Christ under pretence of the *Unity of God*, is no doubt to deny him to be God under pretence of the *Unity of God*, i. e. under pretence that there can be but one God. It is to be observ'd, these Heretical *Jews* believ'd in Christ, but they did not believe him to be really and by Nature God. It is certain they could not but believe him one of Mr. *Whiston's* Gods, a God by Office and Appointment, else they had not believed in him at all. And therefore when this

this Author cautions 'em not to deny Christ, under pretence of the Unity of God, he must mean they should not under pretence of the Unity of God deny him to be truly and by Nature, and not only by Office and Appointment God.

Then Pag. 173, 174, 175. he tells us, *Moses said to Israel, The Lord thy God is one Lord*, and yet owns Christ, when he says, *The Lord rained Fire and Brimstone from the Lord out of Heaven*. That God by the Prophet saith, *Besides me there is no God*, and yet the same Prophet tells us, that unto us a Son is given, that shall be called the wonderful Counsellor, the strong God, and shall be called Emanuel, God with us. That the Evangelists say, that God the Father is the only true God, and yet that the Word was God. And at length, N. 5. concludes, *Whosoever therefore preaches that there is but one God alone, in such a manner as to take away the Divinity of Christ, he is a Devil, and an Enemy of all Righteousness*. Now none of the Hereticks, no body, not even the Socinians themselves, or any of their Predecessors of old, deny'd Christ to be God by Office and Appointment; and therefore this Author, if he speaks to any body, or to any Purpose, he must mean a real and proper Divinity; that is, so preaching the Unity of God, as to deny Christ to be truly and naturally God.

Then, Pag. 376. he calls such as Mr. W. that deny the real, proper and natural Divinity of Christ, a great many hard Names, *Dogs and Serpents, Dragons and Asps, Basilisks and Scorpions*, &c. all which he might have spar'd, for he had made 'em Devils before. If Ignatius was the Author of this Epistle, he was almost as zealous for the Belief of our Saviour's proper and natural Divinity, as Mr. W. is against it.

*The Epistle to Hero.*

Pag. 382. If any one call our Saviour *Ἰσὴν Ἰουδαίου*, a meer Man, he is a Jew, a Murderer of Christ.

Mr. W. refers us to Manuscripts, where *Ἰσὴν* is wanting; but 'tis in so many other Places of these Epistles,

pistles, that he might have kept it in without Brackets.

I observe there is no Opposition between being a *mere Man*, and *being God*, in Mr. Whiston's Sense: One may call him a *mere Man*, and immediately call him *God*, and in both say truly. And therefore I conclude, when *Ignatius* condemns calling our Lord a *meer Man*, 'tis all one as if he had censured denying him to be *truly God*. I think there is nothing more that signifies any thing either to Mr. Whiston or me, in this Epistle.

Upon the whole, I think I have brought enough, both out of the Larger and Smaller Epistles, and those three newly discovered too, to prove that Mr. W. has made no great Purchase for the *Arians* by all the Pains he has taken about *Ignatius*.

It is very strange to me, that if *Ignatius* had thought *Christ* to be *God* only in Mr. Whiston's Sense, *i. e.* by Office or by the Appointment of *God*, we should never have the least Hint of it in any one of those many Places where he is so plainly stiled *God*.

The next Father I shall mention is *Hermas*, who tho' he be not, as some of the Fathers sometime seem'd to think, an inspired Writer, yet is certainly a very antient Author, and probably liv'd in the Time of the Apostles, as he must certainly do, if he be, as some think, that *Hermas* mention'd by St. Paul. Others indeed place him much lower, *i. e.* in the second Century; but to consider that Point of Chronology is above me, and not my Business at this time. We have only a Latin Translation of his Book, but probably a good one, since it agrees so well with those Parts of the *Greek Text* we find cited by other Fathers.

The Author, *Simil. 9.* hath these Words: *Indeed the Son of God is more antient than any Creature, and sate in Council with his Father about making the Creatures.* These Words seem plainly to prove both his *Pre-existence and Divinity*: His *Pre-existence*, he was more antient than any Creature; his *Divinity*, 'tis below the Deity to consult with any one Creature about making



making other Creatures, he that is of Council to God must himself be God.

Some pretend 'tis uncertain whether these Words be spoken of *Christ*, because *Hermas*, *Sim.* 5. calls the Son of God the Holy Spirit. But 'tis plain he does this in a general Sense, as any of the Three Persons may be called an Holy Spirit; and the whole Context shews they are spoken of our Saviour.

*Sim.* 9. *The Name of the Son of God is great and immense, and the whole World is sustained (upheld) by him.* And a little after, *Every Creature of God is sustained (upheld) by his Son.* Here we see the Son of God is plainly implied not to be a Creature, but the Upholder of every Creature; and if the Conservation of the whole Creation here attributed to the Son by *Hermas*, do not shew he thought him truly God, I know not what can do it.

The next Father I shall mention is *Barnabas*, *Ed. Vossii*, 1680. I shall not much concern my self with the Dispute between Learned Men concerning this Epistle, whether it be genuine or no. Some Learned Men tell us it was never heard of till *Justin Martyr*: He cites the false *Esdra*s as a true Prophet; and *Tertullian* tells us it was rejected by the Greek Churches. But we need not doubt it was antient.

*Pag.* 219. Plainly speaking of our Saviour, he calls the Sun, *the Work of his Hands.*

*Pag.* 217. *Whereas he is the Lord of the whole World, to whom God said before the Creation of the World, Let us make Man after our Image, and after our Likeness.*

*Pag.* 238. *Herein also we have the Glory of Jesus, that all things were by him and for him.*

I think these Places unexceptionably prove both the Pre-existence and the Divinity of *Christ*.

There are some other Places that might be brought out of this Epistle, but because they are more disputable, I will omit them.

Tho' the Book called the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs be a Fiction, yet it being an antient Book, and Mr. *W.* by his citing of it seeming to set some Value upon it, I will briefly cite some Passages of it, which seem to make it plain what was the Doctrine of the Church at that time, or at least of the Author of that Book.

*Test. Sim.* The Lord the Great God of Israel appearing on Earth as a Man, &c. He calls the Messias God-Man, or God and Man.

*Levi Test.*—The Lord shall appear among Men to save, &c.—By the suffering of the Most High.

*Test. Jud.* Mention is made of the Appearing of the God of Righteousness, meaning the Messias.

*Test. Zab.* And ye shall see God in the Likeness of Man.

*Test. Dan.* For the Lord shall be in the midst of her, i. e. Jerusalem, conversing with Men, &c.

*Test. Nepht.* God shall appear dwelling on Earth among Men.

*Test. Aser.* The Most High shall visit the Earth, and coming as a Man, eating and drinking with Men, &c. he shall save Israel, and all Nations.

*Test. Benj.*—Worshipping the King of Heaven, that will appear on Earth in form of an humble Man. Then he tells us the Israelites shall be judged, because they did not believe in their Deliverer, God coming in the Flesh.

These Testimonies need no Comment. I confess the Book is of no great Authority; however Testimonies out of it may be as good against Mr. *W.* as for him. Here are Titles given to *Christ* as high and great as can well be given to the Supream God.

I now come to *Justine Martyr*; and I shall produce his Testimonies in order as they are in his Works, *Par. Ed.*

*Cohort. ad Grec.* pag. 36. speaking of our Saviour, he hath these Words: *Who being the Logos, the Word of God,*

God, ἀχώριστος συνάμαρ, undistinguish'd, or not separate in Power, taking upon him Man made after the Image and Similitude of God, &c.

Ἀχώριστος συνάμαρ, not separate, not distinguish'd in Power. If there be no difference between the Power of God the Father, and of the Logos or Son, sure the Son must needs be God.

He took upon him Man made after the Image of God. Mr. Whiston may consider how a Body with only a sensitive Soul, which he supposes the Logos to have assum'd, can be Man at all, much less Man made after the Image of God.

Apol. i. pag. 44. But his Son, who alone is αὐτός, properly or peculiarly his Son, the Logos (Word) being with him, and begotten by him, συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, before the Creation; for by him at the Beginning made he all things.

It cannot enter into my Head, that he that can make a World can be less than truly and properly God; and then he must be Eternal, tho' Justine puts the Words only before the Creation. We know the very same Expressions, before the World was, &c. are used in the Scriptures in a Multitude of Places concerning God the Father, without any Prejudice to our Belief of his proper Eternity, more being (as is usual in many cases) to be understood than is express'd.

The Word συνὼν puts me in mind of a very clear Argument that Justine M. must needs think the Logos or Son of God to be truly and by Nature God. 'Tis plain from many Places, that he thought the Lord that appeared to Moses at the Bush was the Logos or Son of God. Now he that appeared styles himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and makes himself known to Moses by his Name Jehovah, ὁ ὢν, or I am. Now if this Name imply Eternity or necessary Existence, and if this Name belong to him that appeared to Moses, and he that appeared was the Logos, as Justine certainly thought he was; it must needs be that Justine must think that the Logos is Eternal God.



Pag. 60. Having spoken before of the rational Worship the Christians paid to God, he says of the Son and Spirit, *Having learnt that he (i. e. Jesus Christ) is the Son of the true God; and esteeming him in the second Place, and the Prophetical Spirit in the third Order, we shall shew we with reason worship them.* The Word indeed is τιμῶμεν, we honour them; but must be understood of that solemn Worship spoken of in this place. I can here discern no difference in the Degree of Worship paid to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; only the Father is first, the Son in the second Place, and the Holy Ghost in the third (it would be absurd to do otherwise :) but they seem each of them to be worshipped as truly God.

Pag. 68. — *And Jesus Christ, who alone is properly a Son begotten by God, μόνῳ ἰδίῳς ὁ Θεὸς γεγέννηται; and being his Word and his First-born, hath taught us these things.* Here is such a Heap of Words to distinguish the Son of God from any Creature, that it's a wonder if *Justine* could, like *Mr. Whiston*, think this Generation and Creation to be the same thing.

Pag. 86. *But that the Prophetick Spirit might declare, that he that suffered these things was to have an ineffable kind of Generation, ἀνεξήγητον γένεσιν, and was to reign over his Enemies, he saith thus, Who shall declare his Generation!*

This must be meant, not of our Saviour's Generation as Man, nor of his Generation or Creation in *Mr. Whiston's* Sense; for neither of those are ineffable, further than the Creation or making of all Creatures are ineffable, but of that Generation by God the Father, whereby he was ἰδίῳς and αὐτεῖος, properly and in a transcendent manner (as *Justine* speaks in other Places) the Son of God, and therefore truly and properly God. And this *Mr. W.* is so sensible of, that he dare not deny, but perhaps he was made or created of the Essence or Substance of God. Now 'tis hard to conceive how, if he were made of the Essence or Substance of God, he should be any thing less or worse than truly God; for

for to suppose this would be truly to debase the Essence of God.

Pag. 88. Believing (saith Justine) him to be the First-begotten or First-born of the Unbegotten God; ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἀγεννῆται Θεῷ ὄντι. I believe if Justine had been of Mr. Whiston's Mind, he understood Greek well enough to have said, ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἀκτίσθαι Θεῷ ὄντι, the first and most noble Creature that was made by the unmade or uncreated God.

Pag. 95. For at that time when Moses was commanded to go down into Egypt, and to bring out the People of Israel from thence, as he fed his Father-in-Law's Sheep in the Land of Arabia, our Christ spake to him out of the Bush under the appearance of Fire. Here you see Justine thought that 'twas Christ appeared to Moses. This same Christ calls himself the God of Abraham, &c. and tells him his Name was Jehovah, ὁ ὢν, I am. Justine must then certainly believe, that this Christ was truly God.

Pag. 254. Justine speaks to Trypho in these Words: For the present give me leave to mention what Prophecies I please, to prove that Christ is both God and the Lord of Hosts. If to be called the Lord of Hosts be not a Title every where appropriated to the God of Israel by all the Prophets, I know not what is.

Pag. 267. Says Trypho, I have heard your Opinion, and it seems to me wonderful, and what cannot be prov'd; for as to what you say, that this Christ of yours did pre-exist, being God before all Ages, and after that condescended to be born and become Man, it seems to me not only paradoxical, but ridiculous. Well (saith Justine) I know this Saying will be a Paradox to you, and of those of your Nation: But suppose I cannot prove that he did pre-exist, as being God the Son of the Creator of all things, yet you can only say in this I am mistaken, for he may still be the Christ: For there be some of us Christians who believe him to be the Christ, tho' they do not believe him to be God; with whom I do not agree. Says Trypho, Those of you that believe that your Christ was born a mere Man, and by Ele-

ction

*tion and Uction inaugurated Christ, are more easily to be believed than you. For we our selves expect our Messias will be born a Man, and that Elias will come and anoint him. I have somewhat shorten'd Justine's Dialogue, but am very sure I have neither left out any material Part, nor mistaken the Sense of it.*

If there were no other Place in *Justine* to prove that he believed *Christ* to be really and by *Nature* God, and not only God by *Office and Appointment*, this one were enough to do it. For did either the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites* of old, or do the *Socinians* now deny that *Christ* is a God by *Appointment*, as he is the King and Head of his Church? Nay indeed as *Christ* he must be so. Nay does not *Trypho* himself plainly come in with this Notion? only denies what the *Ebionites* believed, that our Saviour is the true *Messias* that was to come.

If *Justine* had been an *Arian*, was it not necessary and almost unavoidable that he should here declare himself to this Purpose? "*Trypho*, I agree with you, and some of our *Christians*, that our *Christ* is not a God by *Nature*, but by *Office and Appointment of God*; only my Opinion is, that that noble Spirit, that in Fulness of Time took Flesh upon him, and became the Soul of *Christ* our *Messias*, did pre-exist before all Ages, and was even then appointed a God by the only True God.

Pag. 332. For he was the only begotten Son of the Father of all things, the Word properly begotten of him, *ἰδὼς γεννημένον*. Surely properly begotten must signify something more than created.

Pag. 340. For he (*Joshuah*) gave them only a Temporal Inheritance, as not being *Christ* the God, nor the Son of God.

Pag. 354. But that the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures calls *Christ* God, I have shewn at large. It had been to much purpose to prove to *Trypho* that our Saviour was a God by *Office*, when he believed already the *Messias* was to be so: And therefore no doubt what *Justine* design'd was to prove him truly God.



Pag. 355. Says he to Trypho, For if ye had understood what is said by the Prophets, ye would not have deny'd him to be God, who is the Son of the only and unbegotten and ineffable God. He seems to argue, that because he is the Son of God, he must be God.

Pag. 357. And that Christ, who is Lord and God, is the Son of God.

I find I have overlook'd some Passages that are material.

Pag. 96. For they that say the Son is the Father, are proved neither to know the Father, nor to know the Father of all things hath a Son; who being the Logos, the First-begotten of God, is also God. Here Justine plainly supposes that Christ's being God necessarily follows from his being the First-begotten of God.

Justine, pag. 286. proves also out of Psal. 45. 6. Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, that Christ is God, and therefore to be worshipp'd, while he in several Places of his Works declares that Christians worship none but God.

Pag. 498. Justine tells us, that God did not, as one would have thought he should, send into the World a Servant or Minister, neither Angel nor Prince, nor any of those that govern either in Heaven or Earth, but the very Maker and Creator of all things, who made the Heavens, and shut the Sea up within its Bounds, &c. What Mr. Whiston may think I cannot tell; but I can't believe Justine thought him, of whose creating, preserving and governing Power he here and in the following Words gives such a large Description, to be any thing less than very God.

Pag. 56. Wherefore, saith Justine, we are term'd Atheists, and we confess indeed we are so with respect to those that are commonly called Gods, but not with respect to the most true God and Father of Righteousness, &c. Him therefore, and his Son that came from him, and hath taught us these things, &c. and the Prophetick Spirit, do we worship and adore. This is a plain and full Place to shew us Justine's Opinion both of the Deity of the Son and

and the Holy Ghost, not only from his declaring that *Christians* worship all three (tho' that be a good Argument, for the Worship of any Creature was never defended till the *Arian* Scheme forc'd them to it) but also because *Justine* plainly opposes the Worship of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (whom he calls the Prophetick Spirit) to the Worship of the Heathen Gods; and would not certainly mention any in opposition to the Heathen Gods, that he did not believe to be God. And indeed *Justine* all along calls the Holy Ghost the *Prophetick Spirit*, owning him a Person; and tho' he do not expressly call him God, yet he in effect calls him so, when he owns he is to be worshipp'd with the *Father and the Son*, and that he was that Spirit that inspired all the Prophets to foretel so many things to come to pass so many Ages after, which none but he who is God can do.

*Pag. 275. I will try to persuade you that know the Scriptures, that there is another besides the Creator of all things that is and is called God, ὅτι καὶ λέγεται Θεός, not only is called, but is God. This he does from the Appearances of God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Moses; which he supposes to be by the Logos, and not God the Father.*

So that upon the whole, I think it is clear that *Justine M.* believed both the Son and the Holy Ghost to be really, truly, and by Nature God, and not to be call'd so only on account of any Office or Power they received by the Designation or Appointment of God.

I shall now produce Testimonies out of *Tatian*, the Scholar of *Justine*, who is cited by *Eusebius* as a Man of great Learning, and the Writer of a great number of Books, all which are now lost, except his Oration against the *Greeks*.

*Tatian at the End of Justine Martyr, Par. Ed. pag. 146. For the Heavenly Logos (Word) being a Spirit begotten by the Father and the Logos (Word) from or of his rational Power, after the Example or in imitation of him*

him that begat him, made Man the Image of Immortality.

Pag. 145. We know him to be  $\tau\epsilon\ \ \alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \ \tau\epsilon\ \ \alpha\epsilon\chi\eta\nu$ , the Principle, Beginning, or Cause of the World.

Pag. 146. The Logos therefore before the Creation of Man was the Maker of the Angels.

By these Places we plainly see the Pre-existence of our Saviour, that he is a distinct Person from the Father, begotten by him, and of him, of his rational Power, and that he was with the Father, the Maker of all other things, and particularly Angels and Men.

And he that was thus begotten by and of God, and was with God the Father, the Maker of the World, must needs be God. And I think the *Arians* cannot be guilty of a greater Absurdity than to ascribe to our Saviour those Works, that if we know any thing of God or his Works, are Works of infinite Power, and peculiar to God, and yet not believe him to be God.

I now come to *Athenagoras, ad finem Just. Martyris, Par. Ed.* Having hinted in his Apology to the Emperors for the Christians, that they were commonly charged with being Atheists; after a pretty long Discourse, not pertinent to be recited here, he proceeds Page 10 to this Purpose.

I have sufficiently demonstrated that we are no Atheists, who assert one unbegotten, eternal, and invisible Being, &c. who made all things by his Word: We believe also in the Son of God. Nor let any one think it a ridiculous thing in me to say that God has a Son. For we do not think either of God the Father, or of his Son, according to the Fables of the Poets, who make their Gods no better than Men: For the Son of God is the Logos Word of the Father, in Idea and Energy. For by him, and through him, were all things made; whereas the Father and the Son are one Unum, the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, by the Unity and Power of the Spirit,  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \ \eta\ \ \epsilon\upsilon\ \ \epsilon\upsilon\ \ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \ \kappa\epsilon\ \ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \ \epsilon\upsilon\ \ \eta\omega\ \ \epsilon\upsilon\ \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\tau\eta\iota\ \ \kappa\epsilon\ \ \delta\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \ \alpha\upsilon\delta\iota\mu\alpha\iota\ \ \Theta$ . And a little after he proceeds concerning the Holy Ghost.



We say farther, that the Holy Spirit, that acted in the Prophets, does flow from and return to God, as the Rays of the Sun. Who would not wonder then to hear us call'd Atheists, who preach God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and set forth both their Power, (Force) in their Union, (Unity) and their Distinction in their Order. Δεῦννντας αὐ τῶν καὶ ᾧ ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δυνάμιν, καὶ ᾧ ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν : So *Athenagoras*.

I fancy Mr. *Whiston*, when he reads this Passage, must think *Athenagoras* talks like one of his modern Mystery-mongers, he so often reflects upon in his Book. It looks so like our modern *Trinity in Unity*, and *Unity in Trinity*, that *Athanasius* himself, that great Corrupter of Mr. *Whiston*'s Primitive Faith, could hardly have express'd it more fully. This Passage also seems to favour the *Perichoresis*, so often spoke of by the later Fathers. It likewise seems to hit the *Arians*, when *Athenagoras*, speaking of the Son, says the World was made not only δι' αὐτοῦ by him, as the Instrument of God the Father, which the *Arians* would grant, but μετ' αὐτοῦ from him or by him, as a Principal Agent together with the Father, which they would deny. 'Tis to be observ'd too, that he says, when the Son proceeded from the Father, to make the World, it was not ὡς γενέμενον *ut factum*, as made or created.

We have another plain Passage, P. 2. We assert our Belief of God, and the Son his Logos (Word) and the Holy Spirit, united indeed in Power. Ἐνέμενα καὶ δυνάμιν, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

*Theophilus Antiochenus*, at the End of *Iust. M.* he speaks plainly of a Trinity, *Lib. 1. ad Autol. pag. 94.* He tells us, Those three Days that preceded the Creation of the World were a Type of the Trinity; of God, of his Word, and of his Wisdom; where, by Wisdom, he means the Holy Spirit. And that he did not mean this Trinity in the *Arian* Sense is plain, *Pag. 100.* where he calls our Saviour, τὸν λόγον τὸν ὅσα διαπαντός ἐνδιδάμενον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ, The Logos always implanted in the Heart

*Heart of God.* And that before any thing was made he had him for his Counsellour, τὸν σύμβουλον αὐτοῦ, and a little after, Θεὸς ἦν ὃς λόγος καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πεφυκώς, the Word being God, and sprung of God, &c.

Here it is very plain that our Saviour is God of God, and was always with God.

*Ireneus, Ed. Fevard.*

I come now to shew the Doctrine of *Ireneus*, as to the true and proper Divinity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.

*Lib. 2. Cap. 43.* Having there been speaking of the Imperfection of our Knowledge, and that we must not expect to know things like God; he hath these Words, *Neque enim infectus es, O homo, neque semper coexistebas Deo, ut proprium ejus Verbum.* Neither art thou uncreated, O Man, nor didst thou always coexist with God, as his proper Word.

By the Word is no doubt meant the Son of God; and *Ireneus* tells us, he always Coexisted with God: that is, is Eternal, if God be so; contrary to the *Arian* Doctrine, that there was a Time when he was not.

*Lib. 4. cap. 8.* He intimates, *Immensum patrem, a filio mensuratum, mensura enim patris est filius, quia capit eum.* That the immense Father is measured by the Son: For the Measure of the Father is the Son; because he comprehends him. By measuring here he means to be of equal Magnitude and Excellency; and in that Sense, what is immense as God is, can be measur'd by nothing but what is it self immense, and therefore must be God.

*Lib. 1. cap. 2.* He calls Christ our Lord and God and Saviour.

*Lib. 3. cap. 10.* He was God that was both made known in Judea, and manifested unto those that did not seek after him.

*Cap. 20.* Therefore he united Man to God, &c. and a little after,

It was meet that the Mediator between God and Man, should, by his Alliance to both, (per suam ad u-

*troſq; domeſticitatem*) bring both to *Friendſhip and Concord*.

If theſe Words do not ſignify, the Mediator was truly God, as well as truly Man, no Words can do it.

Cap. 23. *The Son of God, who is God, ſhall come.* And again, *God therefore became Man, and the Lord himſelf ſaved us.*

Lib. 5. Cap. 14. — *confefſing him to be God, and receiving him as Man.*

Cap. 17. He proves from his remitting Sins, that he is truly God.

He ſaith of the *Valentinians*, lib. 2. cap. 35. *that they are irreligious not only towards God the Creator, but toward Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt.*

Lib. 2. cap. 41. *The Name Jeſus ſignifies the Lord that contains Heaven and Earth.* He that does ſo muſt be no leſs than God.

He ſome where ſays, *The wiſe Men offer'd to Chriſt Gold as a King, Frankincenſe as God, and Myrrh as a Man.* Sure *Ireneus* believed him to be more than a God by Appointment, for ſo he was as a King.

Lib. 3. c. 18. *This is the true Immanuel, that we may not think him only a Man:* And a little after applies that of *St. Paul*, *Rom. 9. 5.* to him, in the Senſe the *Trinitarians* take it, *who is God over all, bleſſed for evermore.*

Cap. 20. Having ſpoke of his being made Fleſh, He adds, *that was not the Beginning of the Son of God, as being one that always was with the Father.*

Lib. 3. c. 26. He refutes thoſe that believe *Chriſt* begotten by *Joſeph*, not knowing him to be *Immanuel*, God with us, and ſays, *He would never have been call'd the eternal God and King, by the Prophets and Apoſtles, and the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, if he were only a Man.* He there tells us, that beſides that of the bleſſed Virgin, he had *preclarari in ſe quæ eſt ab altiffimo Patre genituram*, a more excellent Generation from the Father, upon account of which he was called God.

Lib. 3. c. 22. He calls him, *Potentiffimus omnium Deus*, the moſt mighty God.

Lib.



Lib. 4. c. 11. He intimates it was the Son of God that appear'd to Moses at the Bush, who is called the God of Abraham, and the *ὁ ὢν*, I am: and therefore he must needs believe him to be very God.

Cap. 14. He saith, He receives every Way this Testimony, that he is truly Man, and truly God. From the Father, from the Spirit, from the Angels, &c. One God the Father, one Word and one Son, and one Spirit, &c.

Ib. cap. 17. This Son of God is every where spoke of in the Scriptures, sometimes as talking with Abraham, sometimes eating with him, sometimes bringing Judgment on the Sodomites; 'twas he that directed Jacob in his Way, that talked with Moses at the Bush.

We see *Ireneus* thought, he that appear'd to the Patriarchs was the Son of God, and the Scripture plainly says he that appear'd was God: *Ireneus* must therefore think this Son of God was truly God.

Ib. cap. 28. Not only before Adam, but before all Creation, the Word (i. e. the Son) glorified the Father, abiding in him, and he was glorified by the Father, as he himself saith, Father, glorify me with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.

'Tis hard to think how Christ could be a Creature before all Creation.

Cap. 37. His Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit, were always with him, to whom he spake, saying, Let us make Man, &c. And that the Son was always with the Father, we have proved at large; nay, he proves it from that very Place the Arians insist so much upon, Prov. 8. 23. The Lord created me, (or rather possessed me) in the Beginning of his Ways, &c. not only as the Arians say a little before the Creation, but as it follows, I was set up from everlasting, *megnolam*; as *legnolam* signifies for ever to come, so *megnolam* must signify from for ever past, or from Eternity, or as we translate it, from everlasting.

I should not know when to make an End, should I attempt to cite all the Places of *Ireneus*, where our Saviour is plainly call'd God, and such Titles and proper  
Ties

Ties and Works are attributed to him, as can belong to, or be done by none but one that is truly and properly God.

Here I must observe,

1. That in those Places I have cited from *Ireneus*, or from any of those Fathers I have yet perus'd on this Occasion, or any Places that I have seen and thought needless to cite, there is not the least Hint given that those Fathers when they call *Christ* God, mean in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, a God by Office and Appointment. But as far as I can see, they do mean God properly speaking, one that is truly and by Nature God.

2. That *Ireneus* makes it plain, lib. 3. cap. 6. what his Meaning is in this Case. He says that neither the Lord, nor the holy Spirit, nor the Apostles, did definitively and absolutely call any one God, unless he were very God. And afterwards, that when the Scriptures name those Gods that are not Gods, it is done in such a manner, or to such Persons, as we may easily see they do not intend God by Essence and Nature, but by Designation and Appointment, or Opinion, or some such thing. Therefore I cannot but think Mr. *W*—n the most trifling Author that ever I met with; who, when under his 4th Article he had produc'd a great many Citations that are as plain as one can wish, to prove *Christ* God, thinks to sham us off with referring us to a few Places of Scripture, where Angels, Magistrates, or the Gods of the Heathen are called Gods; and in all which 'tis plain at first sight, the Word God is us'd in a metaphorical Sense.

And thus I have done with *Ireneus*.

Before I proceed to the Testimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, I shall produce a Testimony or two out of *Melito Sardensis*, the Loss of whose Works Mr. *Whiston* so much bewails. But if we may judge of him by those few Fragments that are preserved in Authors, he would have been no mighty Friend to Mr. *W*—n; For when he, i.e. *Christ* was together perfect God and perfect Man, he demonstrated to us his two Natures. *Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ὁμοῦτε*

ὁμύτε καὶ ἀνθρώπων τέλει, &c. And a few Lines after,  
The Meanness of his Flesh did hide the Tokens of his Divi-  
nity, altho' he were before all Ages very God. Καὶ ὡς δε-  
ὸς ἀληθῆς παλαιῶνι ὑπάρχων.

This is a full Testimony. I cannot see what Words  
can be used more fully to express the true Divinity of  
Christ, than to say he was perfect God, and very God be-  
fore all Ages.

This appears from another Passage of Melito, where  
he says, We are not the Worshippers of Stones that have no  
Sense; but we are the Worshippers of the only God, who is  
before all things, and above all things, and of his Christ,  
who was truly God the Word (ὡς ὁ θεὸς λόγος) before all A-  
ges. Nothing can help Mr. W. out in such Passages as  
these, but his 4th Article, Truly God, i. e. truly ap-  
pointed a God. Such shuffling Interpretations as these  
are like heavy Canon, they beat down any thing. I  
depend upon Bishop Bull, as to these two Citations,  
not having the Books from which he cites them. And  
I think I may safely do it, having examined so many  
of his Citations, and finding them all exactly true.  
*Vid. p. 86. F. Ed.*

Let us now see what Testimonies concerning the Di-  
vinity of Christ, Clemens Alexandrinus will afford us.

This is one of the Antenicene Fathers Mr. Whiston is  
not pleas'd to pay his Respect to in his Collections. But  
tho' Clemens and Mr. Whiston may be fallen out, for a  
Reason that may be guess'd at, some others may be  
willing to hear what Clemens says to this Matter. And  
therefore I shall not, as Mr. W. does, so far affront  
Clemens as not to take his Testimony. I cite *Par. Ed.*  
1629.

Page 5. He cites John 1. And the Word was God.  
That we are the rational Workmanship of God the Word:  
And a little after, Wherefore this Logos (Word) Christ  
was of old the Cause of our Being, (for he was in God) and  
of our well being: But now this Logos (Word) hath him-  
self appear'd unto Men, being alone both God and also  
Man.



I am afraid Mr. *Whiston's* Christ is neither God nor Man. He cannot be truly God, for he is a Creature; and I think he cannot be truly Man without an human rational Spirit.

Pag. 8. For John who was Fore-runner of the Logos, *ἀνέβη τὸ λόγῳ*, thus exhorted them to prepare themselves for the Coming of Christ the God. *Θεὸς τὸ Χριστὸς*.

The very Name *Christ* implies Mr. *Whiston's* God by Appointment, and I think therefore it was needless *Clemens* should add the Word God, if he meant it in no other Sense but that.

Pag. 56. Taste and see that Christ is God, *ὅτι Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός*. Here we see plainly there is nothing in that Distinction that *Christ* is called God without the Addition of the Article; but God the Father with it, wherein *Sandius* and others would make us believe there is imply'd that Christ is not truly God as God the Father is. There are Multitudes of Places in the Fathers that confute that Observation, and shew that it is a Distinction without a Difference.

Pag. 66. Believe, O Man, him that is both Man and God. Believe, O Man, him that suffer'd, and is worshipped, the living God, *Θεῷ ζῶντι*. Believe, O Men, him who alone of all Men is God, *μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων Θεῷ*. Here is *Θεός* with the Article again apply'd to our Saviour.

I think it would not very well suit one of Mr. *Whiston's* Gods to be called the Living God, a peculiar Title given in Scripture to the true God. And when he says *Christ* alone of all Men is God, he must mean in a proper Sense, for in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, other Men may be Gods, and *Christ* would have been so, tho' he had been no more than Man.

Pag. 68. The Divine Logos, who was most manifestly very God, or truly and indeed God, *ὁ φανερώτατος ὁντως Θεός*. He that was equal to the Lord of all, *ὁ τῷ δεσπόῃ τῶν ὅλων ἰσῶθεὶς*, Because he was his Son, and the Logos (Word) was in God, *ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*.

Here our Saviour is called *ὁ ὡς Θεός*, indeed God, and equal to God, *i. e.* in his Godhead, in his Divine Nature, as truly God as God is, tho' not in every respect equal as he is the Second Person in the Trinity. Nay *Clemens* argues he must be so, because he is the Son of God; by which it is plain *Clemens* thought he had a peculiar and indeed a proper Generation, such as that whatsoever is begotten of God, is, and must be God. Here is likewise implied his intimate Union with God, he was not only *with God*, but *in God*.

Pag. 74. Speaking of the *Logos*, he plainly says he is *Eternal*, *αἰδίδι* *ἐστίν*. And pag. 75. the best Sight or Spectacle to the Father is his *Eternal Son the Conquerour*, *ὡς αἰδίδι*.

How well this agrees with the *Arian* *ἦν ὁ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, there was a Time when he (the Son) was not!

Pag. 79, 80. Our Master is like to God his Father, whose Son he is, *impeccable, unreprouceable, impassible, God in the Likeness of Man, undefiled, serving his Father's Will; the Logos, God, he that is in the Father* *ὁ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ*, God with a Shape or Likeness *ὡς τῷ σχήματι*.

Pag. 82. Our Lord is profitable to us in all Things, and helps us in all Things, both as Man and as God, forgiving our Sins as God, and instructing us not to sin, as Man.

Pag. 83. He is the best Guide, not a blind one, as the Scripture says, leading the Blind into the Ditch; but one who is most quick sighted, and the *Logos* that sees through the Things that are in the Heart, *διὸς αὖν τὰ ἐν καρδίᾳ*. I suppose none will deny but to see through, or to be a Searcher of the Heart, is properly belonging to the True God.

Pag. 91. Citing that Place, *Isa. 9. Unto us a Son is born, &c. and he shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, &c.* *Clemens* crys, O Great God! O Most Perfect Child! The Son in the Father, and the Father in the Son!

Pag. 92. He calls Christ, *the perfect Logos (Word) springing out of the perfect Father.* 'Tis like therefore he was of the same Nature with the Father.

Pag. 102. *O mystical Wonder! there is one Father of the Universe; there is one Logos (Word) of the Universe; and, there is one Holy Ghost, and he is every where.*

I suppose *Clemens* will not deny Ubiquity to the Son, as God, when he gives it to the Holy Ghost: Ubiquity is a proper Attribute of the true God. And so we have here as plain a Trinity as is any where to be found in *Athanasius*, or any of the *Post-nicene* Fathers. The *Arians* did not allow Ubiquity to the Son and Spirit; but fancied certain Spaces or Places wherein they were circumscrib'd.

Pag. 109. *But our Master is the Holy God Jesus, the Logos (Word) the Governour of all Mankind, that God himself, who is a Lover of Men, is our Master: The Holy God, God himself, &c. the Governour of all Mankind, sure Christ must be very God.*

Pag. 113. *There is nothing therefore hated by God, nay nor by the Logos (Word) for they are both One, God: ἐν ᾧ ἁμῶς Θεός; not εἰς, but ἐν.*

Pag. 119. *So that 'tis plain, the God of the Universe is only One, Good, Just, the Creator, the Son in the Father, ὃν ἐν Πατρὶ, to whom be Glory for ever, Amen: The Son in the Father is One God.*

Pag. 161. *And being girded with a Towel he washed his Disciples Feet, not being puffed up, tho' he were God and Lord of all. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος Θεός καὶ καὶ ὁ ὅλων.*

Pag. 233. Speaking of Modesty and Shamefacedness with respect to Sin: *At Home we must reverence our Parents, in the Ways those we meet, in the Baths the Women, in Solitude our selves; but every where the Logos (Word) who is every where, πανταχῇ δὲ ὁ Λόγος, ὅς ἐστι πανταχῇ, and without him was not any thing made: For by this means only a Man will never fall, if he thinks that God is always with him; no doubt he means God the Son.*

Here we see plainly the *Logos* is Omnipresent God.

Pag.



Pag. 236, 237. For he cannot be poor that hath the Almighty God, the *Logos* (Word) nor wants he any of those things he hath need of. Ὁ ὁ παντακράτωρ Θεὸς Λόγον ἔχων.

Mr. Whiston somewhere in his Book pretends the *Ante-nicene* Fathers every where avoid ascribing the Attributes of God to the *Logos*; and he, as I remember, particularly insists upon the Word *παντοκράτωρ*, as peculiar to the Father.

But here *Clemens* calls the *Logos παντακράτωρ*, Almighty; and it signifies not only his Power but his Sovereignty, that he is not only Almighty, but the High and Mighty God.

Pag. 266. In the End of this Book called *Padagogus*, he makes a solemn Address to Christ. As to what remains, after such a Commendation of the *Logos* (Word) let us make our Prayer to the *Logos* (Word), Thou Master have mercy on thy Children, thou Father, thou Chariot of Israel, thou Son and Father both one, ἐν ἑμῶν, thou Lord give us, &c. And a little after, he pours out Praises to the most Holy Trinity in this manner: To the only Father and Son, to the Son and Father, to our Master and Instructor the Son, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, πάντα τὰ ἐνὶ, in whom are all things, for whom are all things, for whom alone is Eternity, of whom all are Members, i. e. all Christians, whose are Glory and Eternity; (for so I translate ἡ δόξα αἰῶνες) in all things Benign, in all things Good, in all things Wise, in all things Just, to whom be Glory, both now and for ever.

If these Words do not prove that *Clemens* believ'd a Co-essential Trinity, or One God in Three Persons or Subsistences, I know not what Expressions could do it. And I think they are equivalent to our Prayer in our Litany; O Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God, have Mercy upon us miserable Sinners.

Pag. 267. In his Hymn to Christ, he calls him *Logos αἰῶνα* the Eternal *Logos* (Word) *ἡἰων ἀπείλη* the Eternal Age, the Age that cannot be fill'd up, i. e. to which nothing

nothing can be added either *à parte ante*, or *à parte post*, οὕτως αἰδίου the *Eternal Light*; and concludes his Hymn Ἰλάωμεν ὁμῶς Θεὸν εἰρήνης, *Let us praise (sing of) together the God of Peace*: By which no doubt he means Christ our Saviour.

Pag. 446. Some pretending the Example of Christ, in Disparagement of the State of Matrimony. *Clemens* gives the following reason why our Saviour did not marry; nor was it necessary for him to beget Children as being one that abides for ever, αἰδίως μένοντι, and was born the only Son of God. By αἰδίως μένοντι, *Clemens* seems to me to mean more than an Eternity, *à parte post*: If he had meant only that, I think, he would have said μένοντι εἰς τὴν αἰώναν ἢ αἰώνων; but whether he here by αἰδίως μένοντι, means a Duration from all Eternity, as well as to all Eternity, is no great matter; There are other Places enough in the *Ante-nicene* Fathers, to prove the proper Eternity of Christ.

Pag. 517. Our Lord thus draws nigh to the Righteous, and nothing of the Thoughts and Reasonings we have is hid from him: I mean our Lord Jesus Christ, who by his Almighty Will, παντοκράτορι δελήματι, is the Overseer of our Hearts. Here are plainly both Omnipotence and Omniscience ascribed to our Saviour, and he is in effect styled πανταρχαίως.

Pag. 553. We see *Clemens* was not of Opinion that the *Logos* was in his own Nature visible, nor at all so, till he assumed Human Nature.

And therefore, if some of the Fathers that sometimes seem to speak otherwise, did not mean by the *Logos* being visible, his assuming a Shape and Appearance, as a kind of *Preludium* of his taking Human Nature upon him, their Notions and Reasonings were very gross, and very unworthy of that Dignity which even the *Arians* themselves ascribe to his Nature: However, the *Arians*, who, I think, are as unfair and shuffling Arguers as ever yet appear'd in the World, are glad to catch at any Expressions in the Fathers that may lessen the Son of God, and place him in the Rank of a Creature.

Pag. 644. *There is One unbegotten, God Almighty, and One begotten before πρῶτον, by whom were all things made, and without him was not anything made that was made; for there is One truly God, τῷ ὄντι Θεός, who gave beginning to all things, meaning the First begotten Son, as Peter (I suppose he means some Apocryphal Work of Peter) writes, rightly understanding that, in the beginning God made the Heaven, the Earth. And*

Here we see One begotten God the Father, One begotten God the Son, styled by Clemens τῷ ὄντι Θεός. Creation ascribed to God the Son, and yet ascribed to One God; which certainly must suppose such a Distinction, and such an Union between these Two, as that tho' Creation be ascribed to both, yet there is but One God.

Pag. 649. οὐδὲν ἀκατάληπτον τῷ υἱῷ τῷ Θεῷ, *nothing is incomprehensible to the Son of God. The Arians thought the Logos did not comprehend either God the Father, or himself.*

Pag. 702. *But the most Perfect, and most Holy, the most Principal and Kingly, and by far the most Beneficent is the Nature, i. e. the Person of the Son, which is most near to the alone Omnipotent, this is the greatest Excellence, which orders all things according to the Will of his Father, and governs the Universe in the best Manner, doing all things with an unwearied and inexhausted Power, because he works, having still respect to his secret and hidden Notices; for the Son of God never goes off his Watch, as one who is not divided nor distracted, nor passes from Place to Place, but is always every where, and circumscribed nowhere: Being all Mind, all Paternal Light, all Eye, sees all things, hears all things, knows all things.*

I know not what Mr. Whiston may do: But I must believe Clemens thought him, to whom all these glorious Powers and Properties belong, no less than truly and properly God, and that he needed no Office or Appointment to constitute him God.

Pag. 711. *As the Sun illuminates not only Heaven but all the World, &c. So the Word, the Logos, being every where,*



*where, overlooks the very least of the Actions of our Lives.*

I might give many more Instances, where *Clemens* calls our Saviour, Θεὸς ἐν σαρκί, God in the Flesh; σωτήρ Θεός, God our Saviour, and such like. But I am afraid I have tired my Reader already, and therefore shall only remark, That it was not without Reason Mr. *Whiston* excludes this Father out of his Collections.

Having thus finished my Collections out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, I shall now proceed to his Scholar *Origen*, and see whether he be so totally Arianized as some suppose him to be.

Indeed he wrote and dictated a great deal; he affected a Mystical and Allegorical Way of Writing; he saw, or thought he saw, a great many things in several Places of Scripture, that those that have not his Parts and Penetration, could never find there since. It was very hard for a Man that wrote so much, to write thoroughly well. He has had a great many Enemies, and not a few Friends. His Works were once the great Subject of Dispute in the Christian Church: Some defending, others condemning them: Some pronouncing him plainly Heretick; others, with more Charity, giving him a milder Censure. So that some think (what for good Will, and what for ill Will) his Works have suffered a great deal. *Ruffinus*, who translated many of his Works, is thought, out of Kindness, to have concealed, or minced and mollified some of his harsh Expressions: And some say *St. Jerome*, the contrary. And he was a Man of that Learning and Authority, that some of the Hereticks have been said to think it worth while to tamper with his Works, by foisting in here and there an Interpolation.

But however that may be, we must now take him as we have him; and tho' I will not say (how it comes to pass I know not) but there may be a great deal in

*Origen*

*Origen* that may look towards *Arianism*, yet, I think, as to the main, and especially in his latest and most judicious Works, and when he declares himself upon due Consideration, we shall find him in this point Orthodox: However, I shall produce no Testimonies but what I think full and home to my Purpose. And *Mr. Whiston*, who wants neither Learning nor Industry, nor Zeal in this Matter, I suppose, has brought what of *Origen* may serve to strengthen his Cause.

I shall begin with *Origen's* Book *De Principiis*, where one would think, if any where, he should speak his Mind as to the Trinity. And tho' in other Points the Book be full of extravagant Notions, yet, I think, in this we shall find him plainly declaring for what we call Orthodoxy, and what *Mr. W.* calls the Corruption of the Primitive Faith.

In his *Preface* or *Proem*, he declares the great Subjects of the Christian Doctrine, and consequently of his intended Book, and particularly as to *God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost*: That there is One God who created all things, &c. That *Jesus Christ* who came, was born of the Father before all Creation, &c. That when, as he was God, he was incarnate, and that he became Man, which was God, &c. And, that the First Preachers of the Gospel delivered, that the Holy Ghost is joyned in Honour and Dignity with the Father and the Son, &c.

That *Origen* understood more by this, than the *Arians* will grant, we shall see by what follows.

Cap. 2. First we must know that in *Christ* the Nature of that Divinity, which is the only begotten Son of the Father, is one; the Human Nature another, &c. Nor let any think we speak any thing against his Subsistence (in Substantivum) when we call him the Wisdom of God, &c. By which it appears he means not by Wisdom a Quality or Attribute, but a Person or Subsistence.

If therefore it be rightly allowed, that the only begotten Son of God, his Wisdom is substantially subsisting (substantialiter subsistentem, &c. *Mark*, substantially subsisting.

Now how can any one think or believe that God the Father was at any time, tho' it were but for a Moment of Time, without the Generation of this Wisdom: This substantial or subsisting Wisdom the Son, was equally Eternal with the Father.

Wherefore we know that God was always the Father of his only begotten Son that was born of him, and received what he is from him, yet without any Beginning, &c.

We must believe that this Wisdom was begotten (generated) without any Beginning that can be named or understood.

He that ascribes any Beginning to this Word or Wisdom of God, let him look to it that he do not shew himself impious against the unbegotten God, when he denies him to have been always a Father, and to have begotten the Word.

Then he brings a Comparison from Human Generation, to illustrate the Reality of this Generation; but intimates, that this is to be understood with the Supposition of the infinite Distance between God and Man, that no Comparison can reach it, that 'tis ineffable, and concludes in these Words: *For this is an Eternal and Sempiternal Generation, &c. for he is not the Son of God by Adoption, but is by Nature his Son.*

Afterward he saith, *That Christ, who was in the Form of God by his Humiliation or Emptying himself, designed to demonstrate to us the Plenitude (Fulness) of his Divinity (Godhead.)*

Afterward he saith, *That Christ is the most pure Emanation of the Glory of the Omnipotent. Aporræa purissima Gloriæ Omnipotentis.*

In the same Chapter he hath these Words: *But that you may know that the Omnipotence of the Father and of the Son is one and the same, as he is one and the same God and Lord with the Father. Hear what John saith in the Apocalypse, &c.*

Again: *This Wisdom of God which is his only begotten Son, is immutable and unchangeable in all things, and in him is all substantial Good, which certainly can never be changed or altered.*

Again:



Again: That is properly called Sempiternal or Eternal, which never had a Beginning of its Being, nor can ever cease to be. Now according to John, God is Light, and the Splendor of this Light is this his Wisdom; not only as he is Light, but as he is Eternal Light: So that this his Wisdom is Eternal, and the Splendor of Eternity. Which, if it be well understood, plainly declares, that the Subsistence of the Son came from the Father, but not temporally (in time.)

Now because the Son differs from the Father in nothing as to the Power of Working, nor is the Work of the Son any other than that of the Father, but they have (if I may so speak) one and the same Motion (Movement) in all things; therefore he is called an immaculate Glass, that hereby may be understood that there is no unlikeness at all in the Son to the Father.

And towards the End: Wherefore we ought not to think there is any Blasphemy in that which is said, there is none good but One God the Father, that we should therefore think it to be denied that either Christ or the Holy Ghost is good. For as we said before, the principal Goodness is to be thought to be in God the Father, from whom the Son being born, and the Holy Ghost proceeding, without doubt retain in themselves the very Nature of that Goodness, which is in that Fountain, from which either the Son was born, or the Holy Ghost proceeded.

I have omitted a Passage about the Middle of the Chapter which plainly shews, when Origen calls Christ the Wisdom of God, he means a personal Subsistence, and not an Attribute or Quality.

Whatsoever things (saith he) we have spoken of the Wisdom of God, may be conveniently adapted and understood as to the Son of God's being called the Life, the Word, the Truth, and the Resurrection; for all these Names are given him from his Works and Powers, &c.

I cannot see that Mr. Whiston's Corrupter of the Primitive Faith, Athanasius, could have said more than Origen has here done. Here is a Personal Subsistence, distinct from the Father, born of him, begotten by

G

him,

him, and that from Eternity, &c. yet the same God with his Father, of the same Goodness, Omnipotence, Wisdom, that the Father is, and immutably so. This does not seem to be very favourable to Mr. Whiston's *Arian Scheme*.

And which is to be consider'd, these are no bye and occasional Expressions. *Origen* is here professedly and directly treating of this Matter, and therefore likely well to consider what he says.

In his 3d Chapter *de Spiritu Sancto*, he hath these Passages. He argues from our being baptiz'd in the Name of the Holy Ghost to prove the Dignity and Excellency of his Nature.

*From all which things we learn, that the Substance of the Holy Spirit is of so great Authority and Dignity, that saving Baptism cannot be compleat but by the Authority of the most Excellent Whole Trinity (Excellentissimæ Omnitritinitatis) that is, by the naming together (cognominatone) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and with the unbegotten God the Father, and with his only begotten Son, must be joyn'd also the Name of the Holy Ghost. The Argument here used by Origen, is one great Argument we now make use of to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

Again: *Who would not be amazed to think how great the Majesty of the Holy Ghost must be, when he that shall speak a Word against the Son, may hope for Pardon; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never Forgiveness, neither in this World, nor in the World to come.*

Whether *Origen* here suppose right or no, when he makes this Blasphemy against the Person, and not the miraculous Works of the Holy Ghost, by imputing them to the Power of the Devil, is no Matter: It argues how great an Opinion he had of the Majesty and Dignity of the Person of the Holy Ghost.

And a little after, having asserted that God is the Maker of all Things, he says, *Hitherto we have not been able to find so much as one Word in the Holy Scriptures,*

tures, whereby the Holy Ghost is said to be made or is called a Creature (*factura esse vel Creatura diceretur.*)

Sure, if he be not made by God as all things were, if he be not a Creature, he must be with God the Father and the Son a joint Creator, and so must be God.

When he asserts the Holy Ghost to be given only to the Saints, but that the Benefits, &c. of the Father and the Son are common to all, he is afraid some might think he preferred the Holy Ghost before the Father and the Son; but he saith that is no good Consequence, since he had before described the Propriety of his Grace and Operation. And he adds: Moreover nothing in the Trinity is to be said to be greater or less, when as the Fountain of the One Divinity upholds all things by his Word, and sanctifies those that are meet for it by his Spirit (*Spiritu oris sui.*)

Sure if the Holy Ghost be not less (*i. e.* not less in Nature, for he cannot mean less in Order or Oeconomy) than the Father and the Son, he must be God as well as they. I think this comes up to Athanasius's Creed, and in this Trinity none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another.

And a little after: But the Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every one according as is convenient, whereby is most manifestly intended that there is no difference (*discretio, i. e.* of Operation) in the Trinity, but that very thing which is the Gift of the Spirit of God, is ministred by the Son, and is wrought by God the Father: Now all these things worketh that one and the same Spirit dividing to every Man severally as he will. And so far (saith he) of the Unity of Power of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

I think, he that asserts such a Union of Power, and Operation of the Holy Ghost, with the Father and the Son, must believe him to be God.

I have insisted the longer upon the Passages of Origen in these Two Chapters of his Book *de Principiis*, because he designed this Book as a kind of Body of Divinity, and begins with the Trinity as one of the first Prin-



ciples and principal Doctrines of the Christian Religion.

I shall now proceed to some other Passages of *Origen*, the Edition of his *Latin Works* I make use of is that of *Paris*, 1512. *Tom. 3. fol. 199.* Let us not say in our Heart, nor think, that Christ is contained within any Place, and that he is not every where, and he himself diffused through all things (*per omnia diffunditur.*) For when he was on Earth he asserted himself to be likewise in Heaven; for so he says to his Apostles, no Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man who is in Heaven. He saith not who was, but who is in Heaven.

Here *Origen* plainly asserts the Ubiquity of Christ's Divine Nature. It seems he was not acquainted with that Evasion of the *Socinians*, who render *ὅς* by *who was*, not *who is*.

*Tom. 3. fol. 214.* On these Words: For this Cause Christ died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the Quick and Dead. Some might object, that if Christ had not died, &c. he had never been Lord, &c. In Answer to this, he asserts a double Dominion of Christ, one as God, the other as Mediator betwixt God and Man: The First he had before his Incarnation; The Second not till after his Resurrection. Christ (saith he) is the Lord of all Creatures two ways; First, as being the Creator, and as such having Power over all things by virtue of his Majesty and Power, he must needs have all other things subject to him, &c. Therefore he is called omnitenens & omnipotens, one that upholds all things, and omnipotent, as *St. John, Apoc. 1.* These things, saith he, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty. I add no more, the Dominion of Christ as Mediator no body doubts of.

Here Christ is plainly supposed by *Origen*, to have a natural Right to the Dominion over all things, and to be Omnipotent; and sure then cannot be less than truly God.

*Tom. 3. pag. 195.* He applies those Words of the Apostle, who is over all God Blessed for evermore, to prove

prove the Divinity of Christ. And having done that proceeds thus: *I wonder how some that read what the same Apostle saith in another Place; There is One God the Father of whom are all things, and One Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things, do deny that we ought to profess the Son of God to be God, lest they should seem to assert Two Gods, what will they do with this Place of the Apostle, in which Christ is plainly written to be God over all things. But they that think so do not consider, that as he does not call our Lord Jesus Christ One Lord, so as to exclude the Father from being Lord, so he does not say that God the Father is One God, so as the Son should not be believed to be God; for that Scripture is true which saith, Know ye that the Lord he is God. But both are One God; because there is not any other Beginning of Divinity to the Son, than the Father. But the Son (as the Book of Wisdom saith) is the most pure Emanation of the only Fountain of the Father himself. Therefore Christ is God over all things; which all things are those no doubt we have spoke of before Principalities, &c. Now he that is over all hath none over him; for he is not after the Father but of the Father. Now this same also ought to be understood of the Holy Ghost, where it is said, The Spirit of the Lord hath filled the World. Now if the Son of God be said to be over all, and the Holy Ghost to contain (hold) all things, and God the Father is he from whom are all things: Here is evidently shewed the Nature of the Trinity, and one Substance which is over all things.*

He that is God over all things, must needs be very God. When we say the Father is the One God, we do not exclude the Son; for they are but One God. The Son is the most pure Emanation of the only Fountain of Divinity, the Father. He is not after the Father, but of the Father. The same is to be understood of the Holy Ghost. And this is in *Origen's* Sense the Nature of the Trinity. There is one Substance which is over all things. If these be not sufficient Proofs that *Origen* believed the Eternal Divinity of the Son, and Holy Ghost, I know not what can be so.

In

In *Cap. 1. Ep. ad Rom.* The Son of God was made what he was not before after the Flesh, but after the Spirit he was before, and there was no Time before when he was not, i. e. he was from Eternity.

In *Cap. 3. pag. 25.* It is not therefore proper to say of that which always was, that is the Word of God, quod propositus est, but of his Soul; which tho' inseparable from the Word of God, yet is created, and later than the Deity of the only begotten Son. Our Saviour was Eternal, and he had a Human Soul; both which are denied by the *Arians*.

In *Cap. 10.* He argues from the Invocation and Worship we pay to Christ, that he is God; and says the Scripture teaches us to give the same Honour and Worship to both Father and Son.

The *Arians* confess we are to worship the Son, but with an inferior sort of Worship.

In *Cap. 5.* Christ was in the Form of God, and seeing that by the Offence of one Death reigned over the People, he did not forget his Creature, nor thought it any robbery to be equal with God, i. e. he did not make any great Account of it that he was equal to God, and One with the Father, i. e. he humbled himself as if he had not been so great a Person.

We see *Origen* thought it not so great an Absurdity to say that Christ was (as God) equal to the Father. And certainly, if he be truly and by Nature God, he must be so, i. e. God as the Father is God; tho' as to the Order and Oeconomy of the Divine Persons, he may in a Sense be said to be inferiour to him, as the Father is the First Person in the Blessed Trinity, and the Fountain (as the Fathers love to speak) of the Deity. Mr. *Whiston* needed not therefore to make such a Noise as he does every where in his Book of this Equality; for no body means any more by our Saviour's being equal with God, but that he is really and truly God: Which, if we can prove, the other follows from it. And, if Mr. *Whiston* can prove he is not God, we must give up the other.



To the same Purpose, *Hom. 4. in Genesim.* speaking of the Son of God, he saith: *For he took upon him the Form of a Servant, even when he is of an invisable Nature, as being equal to his Father.*

*Hom. 6. in Josh.* *Joshua knew not only that he was from God, but that he was God; for he would not have worshipped him, if he had not known him to be God.* He immediately adds, *This Angel was Christ.*

*Hom. 5. in Josh.* *It is certain that from the same Fountain of the Deity, both the Son and the Spirit is to be understood, i. e. to proceed,*

*Hom. 12. in Numb.* *There is therefore this Distinction of the Three Persons, in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which is referred to the plural Number of the Wells: But of these Wells, one is the Fountain; for there is one Substance and Nature of the Trinity.*

I believe Mr. Whiston will not say there is one Substance and Nature of his *Arian Trinity.*

*Hom. 4. in Isaiam,* begins thus: *It is impossible to find out the Principle of God. The Principle of the Rise of God thou canst in no wise comprehend (principium ortus Dei.) I do not say thou, but neither can any other, nor any of those things which exist. Only our Saviour, and the Holy Spirit, who always were with God, see his Face.*

*Hom. 6. in Jerem.* *There are some who in their Opinion distinguish the Antient Divinity from that which is preached in Christ: But we know One God, both for the past and present Time; One Christ, both then and now; and One Holy Spirit, with the Father and the Son, Sempiternal (Sempiternum.)*

There is some difference between *Origen* and Mr. W. The one believes the Son and Holy Ghost Sempiternal, as well as the Father; The other believes them created by God a little before the World was.

*Ibid.* *Our Saviour is the Splendor of Glory; now Splendor (Brightness) does not spring at once, and then cease to spring. As often as that Light arises, from which the Splendor (Brightness) comes, the Splendor of Glory arises.*

Our

*Our Saviour is the Wisdom of God. This Wisdom is the Brightness of the Light Eternal. So then our Saviour (he means as God) is always born. And therefore he saith, He begets me before all the Hills, not as some read it ill, he did beget me, if our Lord is always born of the Father, &c.*

It's plain here *Origen* was not of Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion, That this Generation and Procession (or Creation, as he would have it) of the Son and Holy Ghost, was not natural to the Deity, but did entirely depend upon the Will and Pleasure of the Father to beget his Son or not. *Origen* was so far from being of this Opinion, that he makes a bold Step, and tells us, That this Generation not only was from Eternity, but that it is and will be to Eternity. And seems to intimate, That the Son is generated by the Father, and (by Consequence, tho' he does not mention it) the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, or by the Son, as naturally as Splendor or shining Light comes from the luminous Body.

If we were sure he were right in this Notion, all the Noise of Contradiction between Three and One were at an end. However, since we are assured by Reason and Revelation too that there is but One God; and are, I think, no less sure by Revelation, that there are some such Distinctions in the Existence of the Divine Nature as are signified in Scripture by Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I think, we may well conclude, that it is natural to the Deity to exist or subsist after that Manner, and under such Difference or Distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and at the same time, that there is some such an intimate, close, and inseparable Union, not only of Consent and Will, but even of Essence and Nature, that there is as much One God, as if there were none but God the Father.

And for us to pretend to argue from Philosophical Principles to the Impossibility of a Trinity, is not only bold but foolish, to be so confidently dogmatical in de-

denying a thing we can know little of, when we find our selves baffled and nonplus'd, when we attempt to dive into the true Reason of the most ordinary *Phenomena*, where we have Sense and Reason, long Observation and Experience of our selves, and the acutest Men of this and former Ages to help us. And, for my part, I cannot yet see, that with all our Philosophy, we comprehend any thing but a few Lines and Angles; and when we come to apply that to Natural Philosophy, it signifies very little, at least, to help us to see into the true Reason of any thing in the World. And yet we forsooth that find, by sad Experience, after all our search, we understand so little of the true Reason of any the most obvious things, must pretend dogmatically to determine what is possible or impossible as to the Nature of the incomprehensible God.

In a Word: I am so far from thinking there are no mysterious Truths, that I think every thing is Mystery when we come to search into it. And if Mr. *Whiston*, who talks so much against Mysteries, will, with all his Mathematicks, give a satisfactory Account how and why he moves his Fingers, when he writes against the Trinity: I think I may undertake to give him an Account of all the Difficulties about that Mysterious Truth. This by the way. I now proceed.

*Origin Com.* in *Johan.* p. 5. *Ed. Huet* observes, That none of the Apostles have so clearly manifested the Divinity of Christ as John.

*Ibid.* p. 28. He tells us of some that, under pretence of honouring the Father, held that Christ was ignorant of many things that were known to the Father. He plainly says, That he that is styled the Truth, cannot be ignorant of any thing that is true (the Words are too long to cite.) And indeed, when Divine Knowledge or Omniscience is so often here and in other Fathers attributed to the *Logos* or Son of God, it must follow, at least, those Fathers thought, that



when Christ is said to be ignorant of the Day of Judgment, it must be spoke with respect to his Human Nature.

Ibid. 122. *And lest any should suspect that he that is invisible, and is present with every Man, and all the World, is different from him that became Man, and appeared on Earth, and convers'd with Men, to those Words, there standeth one among you whom ye know not: He, i. e. John the Baptist, adds, He it is who is to come after me.*

Here we see Christ in his Divine Nature is Omnipresent.

Ibid. p. 198. We find this Ejaculation to Christ, *Thou Son of God that knowest all things, knowest what is in Man.*

I now come to those Testimonies of *Origen*, that may be taken out of his Book against *Celsus*. This Book was written when he was above 60 Years old. We have the Greek Text intire, and it is confest by all, that it is come down to us the most intire, and least corrupt, and interpolated, of any of his Works. And therefore, it may be well supposed, the fittest of any of his Works to determine what was the Judgment of *Origen* in the Point before us.

Pag. 43. *Camb. Ed.* He applies those Words, *Pf. 45. to Christ, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.*

Pag. 46. He says, *The wise Men offer'd to our Saviour Gold, as to a King; Myrrh, as to a Man that was to dye; and Frankincense, as to God.* Frankincense under the Law was offered to God. And if *Origen* had meant God in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, it would have been a very mean Observation; for our Saviour, as a King, the Christ, or anointed of God, was God in that Sense.

Pag. 52. He saith, *Our Saviour had something more divine under the Appearance of a Man, i. e. that he was properly the Son of God, God the Logos (Word) the Power and Wisdom of God. Properly the Son of God, i. e. by a proper Generation: For, I doubt, Mr. Whiston's Creation* *Ἀποσιδ'τως*, without the Mediation, or Instrumentality of any other, will not make him properly the Son of God.

God. If God the Father had never made the *Logos*, but created Angels and Men without him, it seems then they must all have been properly the Sons of God. And therefore, I cannot but believe, when *Origen* calls the *Logos* properly the Son of God, he meant something more than the *Arian* immediate Creation of the *Logos*.

Pag. 64. *We say these things, not as separating the Logos (Word) of God from Jesus; for the Soul and Body of Jesus were very closely united to the Logos (Word) ἐν μέλει αὐτοῦ γεγενῆς, were made very much one.* This looks something like what we call the hypostatical Union of the Divine Nature of the *Logos* with the Human. I know Mr. *Whiston* will say this does not affect him, who thinks the *Logos* was the Soul of our Saviour. I believe *Origen* did not mean so; because he, in many Places of his Works, plainly asserts, our Saviour (beside the *Logos*) had a Human Soul, as well as a Body. And, I think, a Human Soul must be a rational Spirit, and not only a sensitive one. The Apostle says, He took not on him the Nature of Angels, but the Seed of *Abraham*; that is, he assumed not the Angelick, but the Human Nature. I believe the Apostle never thought of Mr. *Whiston*'s Scheme, else he would never have said of him, who, according to the *Arians*, is already the highest Angel, he took not on him the Nature of Angels. And if he took Human Nature upon him, he must take a Human Soul as well as an Human Body, else I cannot see how he could be a Man; or, how he could be in all things made like unto his Brethren. If an Angel should possess and actuate an Human Body, would he be properly a Man? But according to Mr. *W*'s Scheme, the *Logos* or chief Angel, only took the Body of a Man, and the Soul of a Brute, or a sensitive Soul. And so, I think, instead of being both God and Man, was neither God nor Man.

*Ibid.* He calls Christ God, appearing in an Human Body for the Good of Mankind.

Pag. 108. *We believe this Jesus from the beginning God, and the Son of God.*

*Ibid.* Celsus objects against the Christians this Belief. Shall we think Celsus understood the Christians in Mr. Whiston's Sense, no certainly.

Pag. 164. Celsus objects, *If God must come down among Men, he is afraid he must leave his Seat in Heaven.*

He answers, *That Celsus has no right Notion of the Omnipresence of God: That there needs no change of Place to him that fills all Places; and plainly applies this to the Son of God, as well as to God; or, whether the Logos (Word) who was in the Beginning, and which himself is God, come to us, he will not want his Throne, nor forsake it, &c.* Will Mr. Whiston make us believe, that Origen, that attributes the same Omnipresence to God the Son that he does to God the Father, did not believe him to be truly God?

Pag. 170. *But if the Immortal God the Logos (Word) when he assumes a Mortal Body, and an Human Soul, seem to Celsus to be chang'd and transformed; let him learn, that the Logos (Word) continuing in his Essence the Logos still, suffers none of those things which the Body and the Soul suffer.*

The Immortal God the Logos, and with the Article too (*ὁ ἀβαυαλὸς Θεὸς Logos*) and yet not very God! nay the unchangeable God, that abides in the very same unchangeable Essence even when he condescends to take Flesh upon him. I know not whether Mr. Whiston believe his *Logos* changeable or no: The *Arians* of old believed him mutable, nay peccable too. However, I am sure Mr. Whiston believes him passible, when he asserts he, the very *Logos*, suffer'd and was liable to be tempted as the rational Soul is. Now Origen here only says the just contrary, That the *Logos* suffer'd nothing at all (when he took Human Nature) of those things which the Soul and Body suffer. Here are Three Essential Attributes of God given to the *Logos* in these few Words: Sure Origen thought the *Logos* very God.

We



We may observe too *Origen* here plainly asserts, The *Logos* (Word) took not only a Mortal Body, but an Human Soul (a Rational Spirit :) And so he did not think with *Mr. W.* the *Logos* was the Soul of our Saviour.

Pag. 171. He answering an Objection says, *To this it may be answered, by distinguishing between the Nature of the Divine Logos, which is God, and the Soul of Jesus.* *Mr. Whiston* makes no Distinction between these Two; for he thinks Christ had no Rational Soul but the *Logos* (Word.)

Pag. 237. He reflects upon the Heathens worshipping the Sun and other Luminaries; and intimates, these are but Sparks to the true Light the *Logos*. And invites them to worship him, which he would never do; but that he thought him truly God. I believe there is not a Word in *Origen* that can intimate, he thought it lawful to worship any but him that is the true God.

Pag. 28. Οὐτε γὰρ ἀγέννητον, καὶ πάσης γενήσεως προσδοκῶν καὶ ἀξίαν εἶναι τις δύναται ὡς ὁ γενήσας αὐτὸν πατρὶς, ἕτερον πατέρα ὡς ἐμψυχον λόγον καὶ σοφία αὐτοῦ.

Neither can any one thoroughly know him that is uncreated, and the First Born of all created Nature, as the Father that begat him: Nor the Father as his animatum verbum, his lively Word and Wisdom.

Here is the Son plainly asserted to be unmade, *i. e.* not a Creature, tho' he knows the Father, *i. e.* comprehends him: Both which are directly against the *Arians*, who assert the Son to be a Creature, and that the Son doth not comprehend the Father.

Pag. 320. By this *Logos* (Word) we say that God may be comprehended. This is contrary to *Arius*, who says, *It is impossible for the Son to search out what the Father is in himself: For the Son himself doth not understand his own Essence.* This is but the just Consequence of his making him a Creature; probably there is no Creature in the World that thoroughly understands its own Essence.

Ibid.

*Ibid.* For who else could save Man's Soul, and bring it nigh to the Great and Good God, but God the Logos (Word) (ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος with the Article) who when as he was in the Beginning with God; for those that were fleshly, was made Flesh, that he might be received by them, by whom otherwise he could not be so much as seen, in as much as he was the Logos (Word) and was with God, and was God.

Origen, it seems, was not of the Opinion that the Logos was visible in his own Nature.

Pag. 323. For according to our Doctrine, not only the God and Father of the Universe is Great; for he hath communicated his Greatness, to his only begotten the First Born of the whole Creation, that since he is the Image of the invisible God, he may resemble his Father in Greatness too.

Pag. 385. Celsus says, The Christians might find fault with the Gentiles for serving many Gods, if they themselves did not serve Christ, a Man, whom they pretended to be God.

Origen answers, That the Christians worshipped none but the One God of the Universe; and cites those Places of St. John, I and my Father are One; and the Father is in me, and I in him. Whereby it is plain Origen understood our Saviour there to speak of the inseparable Union of Nature and Essence, between the Father and the Son: So that whatever Distinction there may be, of one from the other, they are One God.

Pag. 387. We then have learnt who this Son of God is, that he is the Brightness of his (the Father's) Glory, and the express Image of his Person; the Vapour of the Power of God; the true Emanation of the Glory of the Omnipotent; the Splendor of the Light Eternal; the Immaculate Glass of the Efficacious Power of God; and, the Image of his Goodness. We know that this is his Son, and he is his Father, and there is no indecency in the Saying: Nor is it any way unseemly for God to substitute such his only begotten Son; nor can any one persuade us, that he, who is such a One, is not the Son of the unbegotten God and Father. Here are most of the glorious Titles put together, that

that are used by *Origen*, and other Fathers, to set forth the Glory of this Son of God.

And thus I have now done with my Testimonies out of *Origen*; and cannot but think, that, as to the Doctrine it self, he was a Trinitarian, and did fully believe, that the Son and Holy Ghost were both truly God. I will not deny but there may be found many Expressions, even concerning these Points, that are not to be defended.

But we must distinguish between the main Bulk of a Doctrine, and the several Explications that are given of it: And therefore, we are to judge of the Doctrine of any Author, by the main Stream that flows through his Works, and not by here and there a bye and occasional Expression, that may, through inadvertency, be let fall by the Author; not so consistent with his settled Opinion. I cannot but observe this as a great Piece of Unfairness in some of the *Arian* and *Unitarian* Writers, particularly, the *Irenicum* and *Sandius*, when they give an Account of these things from the Fathers, that they take care to conceal those Passages, that shew the true Doctrine of the Fathers, and fix upon some *incongrue dicta*, which are, it must be confess'd, to be found pretty plenty in the Fathers, as they are too in other and modern Authors, if they were read with design to find fault. Now these, when they are put together in a Book upon any Point, make, at first Appearance, but an ugly Show; but immediately vanish upon the reading, with fair Allowance, the Books themselves.

I could easily prove what I say, as to the Point before us; but the narrow Limits I have set to these Papers will not give leave. And it would not signify much to the Unlearned, and the Learned have other Books enough to which I refer them; and particularly to the Learned Bishop *Bull*.

*Photius Bib. Cod.* 48. Mentions one *Cains* a Roman Presbyter, in the Time of Pope *Zepherine*, as speaking



ing plainly of the true and proper Divinity of Christ. Says he, he (*i. e.* Caius) speaks very properly of the Divinity of Christ our true God (καὶ μὴ Χεῖρ ἢ ἀνθρώπος Θεὸς ἡμῶν) when he both gives him the Name of Christ, and describes, without fault, his ineffable Generation by the Father. This *Caius* wrote a Book, καὶ πάλαι, extant in the Time of *Photius*; which Book *Photius* refers to. And every body knows would not have commended a Man as Orthodox, who wrote like an *Arian*, when he was so hypercritical upon some of the Fathers as to that Point.

*Hippolitus* likewise, an Author contemporary with *Origen*, if not rather before him; for *Origen* is said by some to have set upon writing his Commentaries on Scripture, in Imitation of, if not out of Emulation to, this *Hippolitus*, who had written Commentaries on a great many Books of Scripture. Mr. *Whiston*, in his Book, brags of this *Hippolitus*, what a mighty Friend he would have been to his Cause, if we had not had the ill Luck to lose his Works. But, I think, the contrary pretty well appears, by some Fragments of him, that have been preserved by *Anastatius* and *Theodoret*.

This *Hippolitus* (whether he were an *Italian*, or *Arabian* Bishop, it matters not, tho' probably the latter) is said to be the Scholar of *Clemens* of *Alexandria* (one of the Fathers Mr. *W.* is fallen out with.) And 'tis probable, he was of the same Opinion with him, as to the Divinity of Christ.

And, I think, this will appear from those Fragments we have of him.

*Anastatius* in *Collectan.* pag. 210, 211. Cites these Passages out of him. He says that he (*i. e.* Christ) is, and is to be understood to be, both the infinite God, and a finite Man: Τὸν Θεὸν ἀπειρον ὅμῃ τε περὶ ἄπειρον ἀνθρώπων, and that he perfectly has the perfect Substance of both, ἡ οὐσίαν ἐκείνου τελείως τέλειαν ἔχοντα, *i. e.* he is properly speaking most truly, both God and Man.

The

*The Divine Nature (i. e. of Christ) as it was before its Incarnation, so it is even after its Incarnation, in its very Nature, infinite, incomprehensible, impassible, unalterable, unchangeable, having all Power in it self, αὐτοδυνατός, and to say all in a Word, something substantially subsisting, ὑποσώσων, and which alone is the infinite and immutable Good; for so I translate αὐτοδυνατός ἀσάδην, no one English Word can reach the Greek.*

One would think this Author had lived in the Fourth Century. Mr. W. may see his Primitive Faith was sadly corrupted long before the Time of Athanasius. To which we may add,

*He (i. e. Christ) suffered no change, nor was he at all, in any thing wherein he is the same with the Father, made the same with Flesh, by his νέκρωσις, Humiliation, Condescension, Emptying himself, i. e. his Incarnation; but as he was without Flesh (i. e. before he took Flesh) he continued without being Circumscribed, i. e. having any Bounds fet to his Essence, being still Infinite, ἄνω καὶ ὑπερῶν.*

Sandius, and others, have no way to come off from these plain Testimonies, but by denying the Work, cited by Anastasius, is the Work of Hippolitus; because forsooth Eusebius, and St. Jerome, make no mention of it. Tho' Eusebius tells us Hippolitus wrote many more Works than those he mentions. And St. Jerome mentions very few more. Just as if he should argue, Hippolitus was no Bishop, because not called so by Eusebius and Jerome. Sure we may take Anastasius's Word for one, as well as for the other.

And as to the Objection they make, that Hippolitus strikes at the Heresy of Eutiches, which was long after Hippolitus. I hope that Work does not mention Eutiches, nor plainly his Heresy. And an Heresy may be confuted, in effect, long before it is: Else how should we disprove Heresies out of Scripture. And most of the Heresies of the Third and Fourth Century were under other Names long before (I think I may

except *Arianism*) and particularly that of the *Eutichian* Confusion of the Two Natures in Christ: So that these Arguments against that Work being *Hippolitus's*, signify just nothing.

We have likewise some Fragments of this Author preserved by *Theodoret*.

Tom. 4. p. 88. *Our Passover is sacrificed for us, Χριστός ὁ Θεός, Christ the God, or our God, i.e. Christ who is God.*

Again: He blames both the Extreame, of those who denied Christ to be God, and those who denied him to be very Man; supposed him rather a Spectre of a Man, than Man. I believe there never were any Hereticks who denied him to be God in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, that being not inconsistent with his being a meer Man.

Again: He that came into the World was plainly manifested to be both God and Man; that he was Man we may plainly see, in that he was hungry, and weary, and thirsty: And his Divine Nature we may again see, in that he was worshipped of Angels, &c.

Here we see Religious Worship plainly infers him to be God to whom it is given.

*Hippolitus* seems, by these Testimonies, to believe that Christ is as certainly very God, as he is very Man.

There is likewise this Testimony cited by some as from *Hippolitus*, plainly proving he believ'd Christ's Ubiquity, and by Consequence, that he is truly God. *He was whole in all things, and every where, filling all things, γεμίτας το πᾶν.*

And this likewise: Seeing the only begotten Logos (Word) of God, being God of God, Θεὸς ὡς ἄλλων ἐκ Θεῶν, did make himself of no Reputation, &c. The very Phrase of the Nicene Fathers.

Also this: Here is plainly signified both the Generation of the only begotten Son of God the Father, and that of the Holy Virgin, whereby he is understood and appears to be Man; for he being both by Nature, and verily the Son

of



of God, and the Father, for our sakes underwent that Generation of the Womb of a Woman, &c. Sure here is understood something more by the Generation of God the Father, than Creation, when it is not only contradistinguished from the real Generation of his Humanity, in the Womb of the Virgin; but Christ is said, from that Generation, to be by Nature, and truly, the Son of the Father. I believe Mr. W. will hardly say his *Logos* is the Son of God by Nature, when he interprets his truly God, by being truly appointed a God. Neither can, I think, that the *Logos* (Word's) being created *αποσὸς δ' τῶς*, immediately, or without any Instrument, will make him by Nature the Son of God. At least, I dare say, this and other Fathers, that call him by Nature the Son of God, never meant any such thing.

Again: It was requisite that he that was to be the Mediator between God and Men should partake of both, that he might appear the Mediator between Two Natures.

Was Christ a Mediator between a made or appointed God and Men, or between One that was by Nature God, and us that are by Nature Men? But, in Mr. Whiston's Sense, One may be a God, that is, by Nature, but an Angel, or a Man: Now according to this Author, our Saviour was to be really of both those Natures, he was to mediate between. I doubt this, as old as it is, is but modern Divinity with Mr. Whiston.

I might likewise cite a great many Testimonies, out of what is preserved of his Works *de Consummatione*, &c. and *de Christo & Anti-Christo*; but those being uncertain, and of no great Authority, I will supersede the mentioning of 'em.

And now, if I may Judge of *Hippolitus* by his Fragments, I am apt to wish as well as Mr. Whiston, we had his Works intire. I am apt to think the *Arian* Cause would not be much the better for it.

I now proceed to cite the Testimonies of *Tertullian* for the true Divinity of our Saviour. I need be the less solicitous about the Judgment of this Father, because

because Mr. *Whiston*, by leaving him out of his List of the *Anti-nicene* Fathers, plainly gives him up to the Orthodox. In the Beginning indeed of his Book, he calls him an Heretick, and an extravagant Writer. He was an Heretick in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, with respect to the Trinity; and he was certainly in that what we modern Divines call Orthodox. And suppose he did write extravagantly in some things, must he therefore be regarded in nothing. *Tertullian* was an extravagant Writer, therefore he was wrong in his Belief of the Trinity. As if one should say Mr. *Whiston* wrote an extravagant Book about a Comet's being the Cause of the Flood, and affronted *Moses* more than any of those he pretended to answer. Therefore he is certainly in the wrong in his *Primitive Christianity reviv'd*. *Tertullian* it may be has, by way of Explication, said some things that look a little odd of the Trinity; therefore he did not believe the Trinity it self. I hope I may make bold, without any Offence to Mr. *Whiston*, to produce the plain Testimonies of *Tertullian* for the Divinity (I mean the true and proper, not the metaphorical Divinity) of our Blessed Saviour, without being obliged to defend and make good what *Tertullian* hath written extravagantly of that, or any other matter. There are no People in such danger of making great Mistakes, and running into great Errors, as great Wits, and Men of great Reading and Learning; witness *Origen* and *Tertullian* of old. I could name some Writers of these modern Times. They often, like *Jehu*, drive furiously; or like young *Phaeton* (who had a strong Conceit he could light the World better than his Father, but unluckily happen'd to burn it.) He was no sooner mounted the Chariot, but

*Fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.*

Which I translate thus from Mr. *Dryden*:

*Great Wits to Madness sure are near ally'd,  
And thin Partitions do their Bounds divide, &c.*

But

But where am I? I am afraid I shall grow a Wit my self, I talk so extravagantly. I'll try to bring my self down a little, with the hard Labour of reading in that crabbed Father *Tertullian*, Pamel. Ed. Apologet. Lib. cap. 21. *We have learnt (saith he) that he (i. e. Christ) was begotten of God, and is therefore called the Son of God, and God, from their being of one Substance; ex unitate substantiæ.*

*Contra Judæos*, cap. 7. *The Kingdom and Name of Christ is every where adored, he is King to all, he is God and Lord to all.*

*Ibid.* cap. 3. He says, *The Magi honoured Christ with Gifts, as God and King.*

*Ibid.* cap. 12. *Behold all Nations rising from the Gulph of Human Error, to the Lord God their Creator, and to God his Christ.*

*De Orat.* cap. 2. *When we say, Our Father, &c. we call him God. And the Son is invocated in the Father; for, saith he, I and my Father are One: We ought to invoke none but the Deity.*

*De Prescriptionibus*, cap. 33. (Tho' some deny that to be *Tertullian's* Work) he tells us, *John calls them Anti-Christes that denied that Jesus is the Son of God (he means certainly as God:)* For he says, *This Ebion did, denying Christ to be the Son of God, begotten of God; but only by Grace, Regeneration, and Adoption, as the rest of the Saints.* — By which, it appears, *Tertullian* thought Christ by Nature the Son of God, and therefore God.

*Ibid.* He tells us *Carpocrates* thought Christ was begotten only as Man, not as God.

Cap. 53. He tells us, *Theodotus* was blasphemous against Christ, when he said he was only Man, and denied him to be God. I suppose he did not deny him to be Christ; and, in Mr. *Whiston's* Sense, God.

*De carne Christi*, cap. 3. He argues against *Marcion*, who denied the Incarnation of Christ thus: — *Thou canst not say if he had been born, and truly put on Man, he would have ceased to be God, losing what he was,*  
while



while he assumed what he was not ; for there is no Danger of Alteration in God, *periculum enim status in Deo nullum est.*

Here it's plain *Tertullian* thought, he that took Human Nature upon him, was before, and continues still, the immutable God.

Cap. 6. Ibid. *The Possession of both Substances shew'd him both Man and God, &c. which Propriety of the Condition of the Divine and Human Nature, is settled with equal Verity of both Natures :* Here we see Christ is as truly God, as he is Man.

Cap. 14. Ibid. *He is made lower than the Angels when he becomes Man ; but as he is the Spirit of God, and the Power of the Highest, he cannot be reckoned lower than the Angels, as being God, and the Son of God.*

The Son (as here in *Tertullian*) is pretty often called in the Fathers the Spirit of God, as he is born of God.

*De Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 6. Being in the Form of God, he thought it no robbery to be equal with God ; Pariari Deo, i. e. Parem esse.* 'Tis plain *Tertullian*, as well as, I think, most of the other Fathers, understood *Phil. 2. 6.* as the modern Trinitarians do ; and therefore must think Christ, in Nature, equal to God, i. e. very God.

Cont. Marc. L. 3. c. 6. *Marcion's Christ was not what he seemed to be—Flesh, and yet not Flesh ; Man, yet not Man ; therefore the God Christ, and yet not God : For why should he not also carry only the Appearance of God.* Just as Mr. *Whiston* may say of his *Logos*, he is God, and not God.

Lib. 4. cap. 9. C. Marc. *As if I durst not assert the Word to be of the Substance of God ; Verbum in substantiam creatoris vindicare.*

Cont. Marc. L. 5. c. 10. *It will be equally true, that Christ, tho' in the Form of God, shall not be very God (vere Deus) if when he was in the Form of Man, he be not very Man.*

We

We see he runs *Marcion* upon supposing Christ not to be very God, as an Absurdity.

In his Book against *Praxeas*, he defends at large the Catholick Faith. This *Praxeas* was a *Patripassian*. He thought the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be One Person; and therefore, that the Father himself suffer'd, and was crucified for us.

The Devil endeavours sometimes to shake the Faith by defending it, i. e. by denying the Distinction of the Persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Unity of the same infinite and incomprehensible Essence.

Cap. 2. We, as we always did, do now believe in One God; but under the Dispensation (which we call Oeconomy) that this One God has also a Son, his Word who proceeded from him — that he was sent by the Father into the Virgin, and being born of her, was Man and God, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, &c. that he sent his Holy Spirit the Paraclet, the Sanctifier of the Faith of them who believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that this Rule ran along from the Beginning of the Gospel, even before the first Hereticks, much more before *Praxeas*, who is but of Yesterday.

Mr. Whiston rejects *Tertullian* because he was an Heretick, as if, because he believ'd some things wrong, he could believe nothing right. *Sandius* saith, *Tertullian* was an *Arian* before, and turn'd what we call Orthodox, after he became a *Montanist*. But *Tertullian* here tells us, he believed the same, as to the Trinity, before and after he was a *Montanist*. And 'tis plain enough his Belief was not *Arian*.

*Ibid.* He saith, The Divine Nature suffers no Division in the Son and Holy Ghost.

Cap. 4. I do not suppose the Son to come from any other than the Substance of the Father; nor the Holy Ghost than from the Father by the Son.

Cap. 8. We say the Son was brought forth by the Father, but not separate; *prolatum sed non separatum*. Whereby he shews that intimate and ineffable Union between the Persons in the Trinity.

*Ibid.*

*Ibid.* I have already told you how you ought to take that Word (another) on account of the Person, not the Substance, as to Distinction, not as to Division.

Cap. 17. The Name of the Father is God Omnipotent, the most High, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Now we say these belong to the Son too under these Names, the Son came, and by these he acted, — being by good right God Omnipotent, as being the Word of the Omnipotent God.

Cap. 2. He says, *The Three Persons in the Trinity, are unius substantiæ, & unius status, & unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, &c.* That they are of One Substance, of One State, and One Power, because One God.

Cap. 13. We never speak of Two Gods, or Two Lords: Not as if the Father were not God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and every One of them God, but, &c.

It would be endless if I should proceed to collect all that might easily be brought out of *Tertullian* about the Trinity. I have chiefly insisted on those Passages that concern the Substance of the Doctrine, without troubling my self with his Explications.

I shall therefore now dismiss *Tertullian*, and proceed to *Novatian*: An Author, whose Work of the Trinity is generally found at the latter End of *Tertullian's* Works; and has been lately put forth by Mr. *Whiston* with a great Encomium, as a Book mighty serviceable to his Cause. I suppose I shall not displease Mr. *W.* if I chuse to make use of his own Edition of *Novatian*, at the End of his *Historical Preface*.

Pag. 350. Now this Word, i. e. Christ, was in the Beginning with God, and he was God. Now who can doubt, but when it is said the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us, Christ who was born, both because he was made Flesh was Man, and because he was the Word of God, was without scruple to be called God.

Nothing can be plainer than that *Novatian* does not suppose that Christ was any way God, on account of his



his Human Nature, which yet he might be by Appointment of God; and the Socinians suppose him to be called God, as he was the Christ of God, not on account of his being the Word of God. Now, if we suppose him a Creature, as he is the Word of God, there will be no Consequence in *Novatian's* Argument: For no Creature can be God in any sense as a Creature, without the special Appointment of God. But *Novatian* supposes him as certainly God, by being the Word of God, as he is Man, by his being made Flesh; therefore he must be certainly and truly God, in the Judgment of *Novatian*, as he is the *Logos*, the Word or Son of God.

Pag. 355. *If it be proper to none but God to know the Secrets of the Heart, Christ sees the Secrets of the Heart*—— So he must be by Nature God.

Pag. 357. *If Christ be only Man, How comes it to pass that he is present every where to be called upon, when it is most certainly the Nature not of Man, but of God to be present every where?*

I believe Mr. *Whiston* himself will not say, his *Logos* he makes a Creature, is omnipresent: I am sure the antient *Arians* did not say so.

Pag. 361. *If Christ be called by the Apostle the First Born of every Creature, How can he be the First Born of every Creature, unless because, as to his Divine Nature, the Word proceeded from God the Father, before the whole Creation?*

If *Novatian* had meant nothing, but the Word was created; methinks he should have told us so, when the thing he speaks of so plainly leads him to it.

Pag. 362. *And whilst there is in him (Christ) something that is above a Creature, the Agreement in him of Divinity and Humanity seems to be assured to us.*

There can be nothing in Mr. *Whiston's* *Logos* above a Creature, when he himself is a Creature. Therefore *Novatian* thought Christ to be God in an higher sense than Mr. *Whiston*;

Pag. 363, &c. *Novatian understands Phil. 2. 6. as the Orthodox now do. Who (i.e. Christ) when he was in the Form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God: And afterwards, If Christ had been only Man, he would have been spoke of as being in the Image of God, not as being in the Form of God, we are sure that Man was made in the Image of God, not in the Form of God. And a little after, He was God, in the Form of God the Father, begotten and brought forth of him.*

By the Form of God (as the Apostle did) I doubt not *Novatian* must understand the Essence of God, and not only some Likeness to God. And this is plain from his opposing it to the Image of God, in which Man was created. 'Tis plain therefore *Novatian* thought Christ was by Essence and Nature God. And, if *Novatian* thought that Christ was by Essence and Nature God, 'tis no wonder he should interpret those Words of the Apostle so as he does of *Christ's being equal with God the Father*, i. e. is God, as well as the Father; and, in the same proper Sense, that he is. For as to the Order, and, as the Fathers speak, the Oeconomy of the Three Persons in the Sacred Trinity, we may allow a kind of Superiority in God the Father, and Inequality in God the Son.

Pag. 366. He argues from the Sense of the Hereticks, some of which were so well satisfied that Christ *must be God*, that, not seeing how otherwise they could avoid allowing *Two Gods*, they asserted Christ to be God the Father, whilst others chose rather to deny his *Manhood* than his *Godhead*.

Certainly these Hereticks of both sorts meant One that was really God: And therefore *Novatian*, if he had been an *Arian*, must have distinguish'd between a God by Nature, and a God by Office and Appointment; which he never does through this whole Book.

Pag. 371. *Who does not understand that the Divinity is impassible; but frail Manhood is passible. Certainly he here speaks of that Divinity he ascribes to Christ, which cannot be that of the Arians: For they believe*

lieve the Divine Nature of Christ is possible, and that it actually suffered in our Saviour.

Pag. 379. *If Christ be only Man, How does he say, I proceeded forth, and came from God? When 'tis plain that Man was made by God, and did not proceed forth from God; for the Word of God did not proceed from God, after the same manner that Man proceeded. And a little after, He therefore being God, proceeded from God; whilst he that came forth is God the Word, who proceeded and came forth from God.*

Here Novatian plainly denies Christ to be a Creature, and makes a plain Distinction between the Procession of the Son, and the Making of the Creatures. I believe he knew nothing of that Arian fancy of the creating the *Logos* immediately by God the Father himself; without the Intervention of any Instrument.

Cap. 31. *He therefore, when as he was begotten by the Father, is always in the Father: And, I say always, so as to prove him not unborn but born. But he that is before all Time, is to be said to have always been in the Father; for neither can any Time be assigned to him, who is before all Time; for it must be said he was always in the Father, lest the Father should not always be a Father.*

This is full against the Arian Scheme, which allows there was a Time when the Son was not, and when God was not a Father.

Tho' this Author does not set himself directly to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, yet he ascribes such things to him, as can belong to none but to him who is truly God. And indeed what the Arians themselves ascribe to him, does by good Consequence infer him to be so.

I would conclude with this Remark, That when I read over Mr. Whiston's Edition of this Author, which I did with the best Attention I could, I could not find any Passages that seemed to favour Arianism, except a Passage or Two, that seem to make the Procession of the Son, to depend upon the Will of the Father, to



which there are a great many Passages in him, directly and irreconcilably contrary. And those Passages are easily accounted for, by a Distinction common among the Fathers of a double Procession or Generation, of the Son; the one Real and Eternal, the other Temporal and Metaphorical at the Creation of the World. Whether those Passages I have cited be irreconcilable to the *Arian* Scheme, I must leave to the Judgment of the candid Reader.

I proceed now to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, the Scholar of *Origen*, the famous Bishop of *Neocesaria*, a Man famous for his Sanctity of Life, and miraculous Works, and of such Esteem in that Church, that they would receive nothing as to Doctrine and Discipline but what came from him.

He set forth a Confession of Faith as to the Trinity, said to be given him by Revelation; which, tho' not mentioned by *Eusebius* or *St. Jerome*, yet is confirm'd to be genuine, by *Gregory Nyssen*, who wrote his Life; By *St. Basil*, who says he was taught that Confession by his Grandmother, and had kept to it ever since; and, by the Fifth General Council.

I shall not transcribe the Whole; 'tis enough to take Notice of what is plainly against the *Arian* Heresy. Of the Son, he calls him *ἡ ἀειὼς εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς*, i. e. the Eternal express Image, as the *Apostle* does of the Person of the Father: By which 'tis plain he thought him Eternal, and of more than *Mr. Whiston's Metaphysical Eternity*. *Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ*, God of God, not a God made by God. *ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς*, the Image of the Deity, as a Son, that is perfectly like his Father, is the Image of him. *Ἦν ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἀληθινὸς Πατήρ*, a true Son, of a true Father, which I believe implies some thing more than to be created *ἀμέσως*, immediately by God. He is called *ἀφθάρσιμος*, *ἀθάνατος*, *αἰδὶς αἰδὶς*, *Immortal of the Immortal, Eternal of the Eternal* God, i. e. hath the same Immortality and Eternity that God has.

The

The Holy Ghost : Ἐν πνεῦμα ἄσιον ἐκ Θεοῦ ὑπαρξην ἔχον, *One Holy Ghost having his Subsistence from God.* Εἰκὼν ἡ ὡς τέλεια, *the perfect Image of the Son, as the Son is of the Father.*

Of the Trinity : Τεὶας τέλεια δόξη καὶ αἰδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεμιζομένη, *a perfect Trinity not divided in their Glory, Eternity and Kingdom.* Do the *Arians* ascribe the same Glory and Eternity to all the Persons of their Trinity? Οὐτε ἔν κτιστὸν τι, ἢ δούλον ἐν τῇ τεϊάδι, *there is therefore neither any thing created, or servile, in the Trinity.* This certainly is not the *Arian* Trinity; for there the Son is created by the Father, and the Holy Ghost by the Son, say some of them. The Son is a Servant to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to the Son. Οὐτε ἐπιείσακτον ὡς πρότερον μὲν ἔκ ὑπαρχον, ὕστερον δὲ ἐπιείσακτον, *there is nothing introducible, as that which was not before, and afterwards comes in.* This does not look like a Character of the *Arian* Trinity, for they will not allow it to be natural and essential to the Divine Nature to subsist in a Trinity of Persons. This Trinity it self, was brought in, according to them, at the Pleasure, and by the Will of the Father. And it must follow from their Principles, that he might have brought in a Quaternity, or any other and greater Number, as well as a Trinity, or created as many *Arian* Gods, as there are Stars in the Firmament.

Οὐτε ἔν ἐνέλιπε ποτὲ υἱὸς Πατρὸς, ἔτε υἱὸ τὸ πνέμα, ἀλλ' ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀνἀλλοίωτον ἢ αὐτὴ τεϊὰς αἰ, *neither therefore was the Father ever without the Son, nor the Son without the Spirit; but the very same Trinity always continued immutable and invariable.* The *Arians* only say just the contrary. There was a Time when the Father was without his Son, and the Son without the Spirit; and that there was not always the same Trinity that now there is. And they that say the Son and Spirit are Creatures, can hardly say they are immutable.

I need look no farther for any Fragments of this celebrated Father. This Confession of Faith, if it be of any Authority, (as I see not why it should not, tho,

tho', I confess, some doubt it) I am sure cuts the very Throat of *Arianism*.

I now come to Two or Three Authors, whose Works are mostly lost, *Theognostus* and *Dionysius*, both of *Alexandria*, and *Dionysius Romanus*: The Substance of what we have of them, we must be beholding to *Athanasius* for. And, I hope, he has not quite lost his Credit with every Body, even since Mr. *Whiston* hath pretended to convict him of Forgery, and runs him down every where in his Book, as an ignorant Fellow. I wonder how such a pitiful, silly, ignorant Writer as Mr. *W.* makes *Athanasius* to be, could corrupt the Faith so much as he is pretended to do; for these Hereticks are often cunning Fellows. But now I think on't, it was no great thing to do; for if Mr. *Whiston's* were the *Primitive* Faith, I think I have proved, it was wofully corrupted long before *Athanasius's* Time. I am apt to think the Enemies of *Athanasius* did not think him so mean a Man, as Mr. *W.* would make us believe he was. Instead of taking such Methods as they did, they would rather have slighted and despised him, as, I doubt not, some Body will do every one that writes against him. However, if it will not turn Mr. *W's* Stomach, I will, upon the Credit of *Athanasius*, produce a few short Passages out of the forementioned *Antenicene* Fathers.

*Theognostus* certainly lived long before the *Nicene* Council, tho' after the Time of *Origen*. His Books called *Hypotyposes* are long since lost, except some Fragments preserved by *Athanasius*, *Athan. Par. Ed. Tom. 1. p. 274.* The *Essence* (*Substance*) of the Son is not any such as is found to come from any thing without, (*extrinsec*) neither is it superinduced from any thing that was not before *ἐκ μὴ ὄντος*, but sprung from the *Essence* of the Father, as Rays from the Light, or as Vapour from Water.— Neither is it (*i. e.* the *Essence* of the Son) any thing of any other Kind, *ἀλλότερον*, but an *Emanation* (efflux)



(efflux) *εξουχία*, from the Essence of the Father. The Essence (Substance) of the Father in the mean time suffering no Division; for as the Sun abiding the same, is not it self lessened by the shooting out of its Rays, so neither does the Essence (Substance) of the Father suffer any Alteration, by having its Image the Son.

I think it appears from this, and a Multitude of other Places in the Fathers, and from the very Simile's they use about the Trinity, such as the Sun and its Light, Water and Vapour, the Root and what springs from it, mention'd or imply'd in this Passage, and the Fountain and its River or Rivelet that flows from it. I say it appears from Multitudes of Places in the Fathers, that they thought a Trinity of some such Distinctions as we call Persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is natural and essential to the Deity or Divine Nature, and does not intirely depend upon the Will of the Father, whether there should be a Trinity or not. And if we grant this, which seems to me to follow from the main Bulk of the Fathers *Assertions, Explications, and Arguments*, about the Trinity, the Son and Holy Ghost must be as Eternal as the Father.

The Creation of the Son is here plainly denied; for if the Son were *created*, he must either be made of *something or nothing*. Now *Theognostus* plainly tells us, That the Essence of the Son, was neither from *any thing without the Father*, *ἐξωθεν*, nor was it, *ἐκ μὴ οὐτος*, from nothing, and so not created at all.

There is nothing that can help us out here, but Mr. *Whiston's* perhaps, or may be he was begotten or created (for they must be all one with Mr. *Whiston*) of the Substance of the Father. But, I think, it is past perhaps, that that may not, cannot be, without such a Division of the Divine Nature, as *Theognostus* here tells us is not. That any Part (if I may so speak) of the Divine Nature, should be the Substance of which a Creature so much inferior is made, so distinct from, and so much below God in Nature, as Mr. *Whiston* supposes the *Logos* to be, without dividing the Divine Substance, (which

(which the Fathers are all against) and debasing it too, I say *may not be*, i. e. it is impossible.

The next is *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, who lived at the same Time with *Dionysius Romanus*, in the Third Century.

'Tis true the *Arians* have laid claim to this Author, and perhaps he had, in his writing against the *Sabellians*, let fall some unwary Expressions that might afterward be laid hold on by the *Arians*. And he was indeed accused by the Church of *Pentapolis*. And a Council called by *Dionysius* of *Rome* about it. But he is defended by *Athanasius* as Orthodox, *vid. Athanas.* 1 Vol. 559.

But whatever unwary Expressions he might have utter'd before, there is an Epistle written just before his Death, to the Council of *Antioch*, that was called in the Cause of *Paulus Samosatenus*; which plainly shews that he was not any way favourable to those Opinions that were afterward held by the *Arians*.

Indeed *Sandius* has the Confidence to deny that this Epistle is authentick, and calls it supposititious. But when *Eusebius*, and *Jerome*, and the very *Antiochian* Fathers themselves, own and commend it, we must beg *Sandius's* Pardon, if we do not suffer Boldness to bear us down.

This Epistle is extant *Bibl. Pat. Tom. 11.*

He calls Christ, ἀκτιστον καὶ ἀνυψῆστον, the *Uncreated*, and the *Creator*, pag. 266. and one that is by Nature Lord, and the *Logos* of the Father, by whom the Father made all things, said by the Holy Fathers to be consubstantial with the Father, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί. None can be by Nature Lord, but he who is very God. It appears by this, and many other Places of the Fathers, that the Word ὁμοούσιος was used (as much fault as *Mr. Whiston* finds with it) long before the Council of *Nice*, with respect to the Trinity.

Pag. 288. For Christ is immutable, as being God the *Logos* (Word.) None can be truly immutable but he that is truly God.

Pag.

Pag. 289. Speaking of Christ, he saith, *He who is God over all, our Refuge*: And a little after, *He who is God over all, the Lord, the God of Israel, Jesus the Christ*.

He acknowledges the *Consubstantiality* of the whole Trinity.

Pag. 284. Ὁμοειδὴς ἐν τῷ εἶδει τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Χριστὸς Ἀδφ, τῷ πνεύματι τῷ αἰνῷ, ὁμοειδὴς τῷ Πατρὶ τῷ πνεύματι. *Christ the Logos, consubstantial with the Holy Ghost, appearing in the Shape of a Dove: The Holy Ghost consubstantial with the Father.*

I can see little difference between ὁμοειδὴς, and ὁμοοσι. Ὁμοειδὴς, I think, signifies of the same Nature, Kind, Essence, which, I think, is the true Signification of ὁμοοσι. Both the Son and the Holy Ghost, are God in their Nature and Essence, as the Father is, and therefore very God: Which is answer enough to those that object that this *Dionysius* was not Orthodox in his Sentiments of the Holy Ghost.

Ibid. *For, saith he, the God of Israel, is that Jesus who was the Logos (Word) before all Ages, as also the Holy Ghost.*

Again: *Nor shall he be guiltless that shall blaspheme against that Loving, Holy Spirit; for that Spirit is God.*

When we have such pregnant Testimonies as those I mention'd before, there is no reason to doubt whether this Work of *Dionysius* be authentick and genuine. And, I think, if *Dionysius* had, any time afore, let fall some Expressions that might be wrested, by his Enemies, to an ill Sense, he, in this his last Work, makes ample amends for them; and that we ought to think either that his Sense was mistaken (as he pleaded it was) or that he was better informed before his Death.

The next Father is *Dionysius* of Rome, who was contemporary with the other. He wrote an Epistle against the *Sabellians*, which is lost, only a Fragment of it is preserved in the Works of *Athanasius*. This shews him



him so Orthodox, that *Petavius* is forced to own him so; and even *Sandius* himself (which is a Wonder) has little to say against him.

*Athanasius*, Tom. 1. pag. 275.

When he had refuted the Heresy of *Sabellius*, he thus proceeds: *I shall now likewise speak to those who subvert the venerable Doctrine of the Church of God, dividing the Monarchy into Three different Powers, and divided Substances, and Three Gods, &c. who are, as I may say, diametrically opposite to the Opinion of Sabellius; for he indeed blasphemously says, That the Son is the Father, and the contrary. But these in a manner preach Three Gods, dividing the Sacred Unity into Three strange Substances (Essences) altogether separate from one another; for it must needs be that the Divine Logos be united to (be one with) the God of all things, ἑνωθῆαι τῷ Θεῷ, &c. and the Holy Ghost must needs abide and dwell in God, ἐμφιλοχορεῖν καὶ ἐνδισαῖσθαι.*

By strange Substances, he means Substances of different Essences and Natures, and altogether separate in their Existence. And such is plainly the *Arian* Trinity, and which makes (such as they are) Three Gods: Whereas in the Trinity there is the closest Union without all Separation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Afterwards he hath these Words:

*Nor can one less find fault with those that are of Opinion, that the Son was a Creature, thinking our Lord was made as one of those things that are truly made: Whereas the Holy Scriptures testify his proper and becoming Generation, and not his Formation, or Creation.*

Here we see we must by no means say the Son is a Creature.

And a good way after he concludes:

*Therefore we must not divide the Wonderful and Divine Unity into Three Divinities, nor, by pretending him created, lessen the Dignity and most excellent Majesty of the Lord (i. e. Christ) but believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy Ghost;*

*Ghost; and that the Logos is One (is so united to him as to be One) with the God of all things, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ Λόγος; for (saith he) I and the Father are One, and I am in the Father, and the Father in me: For so believing, both the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the Monarchy will be safe.*

We see this and other Fathers, tho' they plainly believe a Trinity of Distinctions in the Godhead, yet no such Division or Separation of the Persons, as will prejudice the Unity of God; and such an intimate and inseparable Union of the Divine Persons, as will not destroy the Monarchy: A Term much used by the Fathers. And so much for *Dionysius Romanus*.

I might here insert the Judgment of the Council of *Antioch*, gather'd against *Paulus Samosatenus*, who said that Christ was only a Man, but called God on account of his Vertues and Works.

In their First Confession they say:

*We confess and preach (as knowing it from the Old and New Testament) him (i. e. Christ) the begotten, the only begotten Son, the Image of the invisible God, the First Born of every Creature, the Wisdom, and Word, and Power of God, before all Ages: Not by Foreknowledge, but by Essence and Substance God, the Son of God. They apply those Words of the Apostle to Christ, who is over all, God Blessed for evermore. They condemn them that say, That to believe and confess that Christ is God, is nothing less than to preach Two Gods. They say, that he that preaches, That the Son of God is not God, is a stranger to the Rule of the Church—That all the Holy Scriptures declare that the Son of God is God—That he (i. e. Christ) both is, and works as being the Word, and also God, by whom the Father made all things, not as by an Instrument, not as his by Knowledge (Wisdom) not existing by it self—That the Father begot the Son, as a living, active Being, and existing by himself, and working all in all. That the Apostle calls the Son, who is with the Father, God and Lord of all Creatures—The*

same God and Man, Jesus Christ, was prophesied of in the Law and Prophets, and by the whole Church which is under Heaven, was believed to be God indeed, who made himself of no Reputation, (when as he was equal to God) and Man of the Seed of David according to the Flesh.

And in their Confession of Faith in the Second Council of *Antioch*, against the same *Paulus Samosatenus*, they assert him to be God, and as God uncreated: As God, ὁμοούσιον, consubstantial (coessential) with God; and as Man, consubstantial with Men. And we pronounce these distinct and different between themselves, not to bring in any Division of his One undivided Person; but to denote the Distinction of the Natures and Properties of the Word and Flesh. If these Expressions favour *Arianism*, I am much mistaken.

*Pamphilus*, the great Friend of *Eusebius*, wrote an Apology for *Origen* in Five Books, to which *Eusebius*, after *Pamphilus's* Death, added a Sixth. The First of these Books was translated by *Ruffinus*, and is still extant in *Latin*.

Now it appears that *Pamphilus* was what we call Orthodox, in the Belief of the Trinity, when he defends *Origen* as Orthodox, because he taught, in his Writings, That there is the same Inconvertibility (i. e. Immutability) in the Holy Ghost, that is in the Father and the Son: That the Trinity is equal, and that the Holy Ghost is not a Creature: That as the Father knows the Beginning and End of all things that are, so do the Son and the Holy Ghost know them too: That the Son is, ὁμοούσιος, consubstantial, i. e. of the same Substance or Essence with the Father.

If he counted these Sayings Orthodox in *Origen*, he must needs be of the same Judgment himself.

The next Father I shall mention, is *St. Cyprian*. I shall not insist upon many Testimonies from this Father, because there are hardly any that entertain any  
Suspi-



Suspicion of his being favourable to the *Arians*, except *Sandius*; who has the Confidence to say, and pretend to prove any thing, that makes for his Purpose.

Ed. Pamelii, Ep. 46. *Nor are we ignorant that there is One God, One Christ our Lord, whom we have confess'd, and One Holy Ghost.*

Ep. 73. *The Lord instructed his Disciples, to go and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He intimates the Trinity, in whose Sacred Name the Gentiles were to be baptiz'd. Does Marcion (says he) hold this Trinity?*

*Ibid.* He applies that of St. John, 1 John 5. 7. *And these Three are One, to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*

Here we see, if that Place of St. John be an Interpolation, 'tis as Antient as St. Cyprian's Time. I do not know any great occasion the Orthodox had so early as St. Cyprian's Time, to make such an Interpolation. And I think it full as likely, that the antient Hereticks, whom most believe to have play'd tricks with *Origen's Works*, or the *Arians* afterwards (who let Mr. *Whiston* say what he will) were not generally the fairest Men in the World, I say I think it full as likely, that either of these should strike that Sentence out of some Copies, as that the Orthodox should put it into others. I am not, I confess, like Mr. *W.* who has learnt to hunt dry foot after Interpolations, and has so quick a Scent that he can smell one at the greatest distance, when other People, that have not so good Noses, would not think any thing of the Matter. Tho', if I could but work my self up to a Resolution, that every Passage, in an antient Father, that is not for my Turn, should be an Interpolation, I should be the fitter to deal with him.

Pag. 107. He tells us, *Christ commanded the Nations to be baptiz'd, in plena & adunata Trinitate, into the full and united Trinity.*

It looks as if St. Cyprian thought of some closer Union in his Trinity, than Mr. Whiston supposes to be in his.

Epist. 75. p. 115. *Moreover when we and the Hereticks have neither One God, nor One Lord, nor One Faith, nay nor One Spirit, it is plain, &c.*

If St. Cyprian's Faith, in the Trinity, had been the same with any of those that were then called Hereticks, these Words would not look very proper.

Epist. 47. *We give thanks to God the Father Almighty, and to Christ his Son our God, that saves us ; Deo nostro salutari.*

Epist. 74. *Where he is guilty of Blasphemy against our Lord God Christ ; Blasphematur in Dominum Deum Christum.*

Ep. 77. He calls him, *Christ the God our Preserver.*

Pag. 170. Speaking of Christ: *The Logos (Word) and Son of God, is sent, &c.*— And concludes, *This is our God, this is the Christ.*

*De-Orat. Dom.* Commending Peace and Concord, he saith, *A better Sacrifice to God is our Peace and Concord, and a People united concerning the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, i. e. in their Belief of the Unity, &c.* The Question is, Whether this Unity of the Father, &c. be meant of Mr. Whiston's Unity of Consent, &c. (which is all he can suppose in his Trinity) or some other and higher Unity that we Trinitarians suppose there is between the Three Persons of the Deity?

*De Bono Patientiæ.* *Nor my Brethren, did Jesus Christ our God and Lord, only teach this in Words, but fulfilled it in Deeds.* Speaking of Obedience.

*Ibid.* Citing those Words, *Pf. 49. Our God shall come and shall not keep silence.* He applies 'em to Christ, saying, *This is our God.*

*Lib. 2. Cont. Judeos, cap. 6.* He brings a great Number of Places of the Old and New Testament, to prove that Christ is God; and many of which run in

in such a Style, as is applicable to none but the Great God. Sure he need not take all that pains to prove that Christ is, *by his Office, constituted a Kind of God*; and that he is God, only as Princes are Gods: Nay, it's plain, he neither does nor can mean it in that sense.

Cap. 10. He proves, *That Christ is Man and God* (ex utroq; genere concretus) *constituted out of both Kinds* (he means God and Man in One Person, not the Godhead confounded with the Manhood, by way of proper Mixture, as *Eutiches* thought) *that he might be the Mediator betwixt us and the Father*: Here we see *Cyprian* thought he must be God by Nature, or (if I might so speak) by Kind, that he might be Mediator, &c. so that, if the Father be truly God, he must be so too: No matter whether *St. Cyprian* reason right or no, as to the Absolute Necessity of this. I am sure I reason right as to his Opinion in the Matter. Now, I think, 'tis clear, *St. Cyprian* thought that Christ is very God.

It may not be amiss here to add Two or Three Testimonies of *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*, the very Church out of which *Arius* came. He wrote a Book, *περὶ Θεότητος*, of the Deity, out of which are cited some Passages by the Council of *Ephesus*.

Speaking of Christ becoming Man, he saith, *Ὁὐ κατελείφθη τῇ Θεότητι*, *He was not thereby bereft of his Divinity*.

Again: *Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς Λόγος*, *God the Word became Flesh in the Womb of the Virgin*.

And that he did not understand the *Logos* (Word) of a made or appointed God, appears from a Citation we find out of him by *Leontius*, where he speaking of Christ saith, *Both are clearly demonstrated, both that he was God by Nature, and that he was Man by Nature*; and therefore, as truly God as he was Man. Will *Mr. Whiston* say so of Christ our Saviour?

There



There remain yet Two of the Fathers, who lived some time before the Council of Nice, *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*, both indeed very eloquent Men, and very elegant Writers; but who wrote only Apologies for the Christians, or rather against the Heathen Gods and Worship. And therefore spend most of their pains upon Arguments, *ad hominem*, in retorting the Objections of the *Gentiles* upon themselves. Their Subjects did not lead 'em to any full Declaration of the Doctrines of Christianity. And indeed we find by their Books, that they wrote before they had read, and undertook to defend Christianity before they well knew what it was.

We are not therefore to expect much of the Subject we are upon from these Two, tho' otherwise very excellent Men. And yet we find some Passages in them, that, I think, plainly shew they were not ignorant of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity, at least of the true Divinity of our Blessed Saviour.

Indeed *Arnobius*, when the Heathen objected to the Christians that they worshipped a crucified God, shews, that notwithstanding that, the Christians had much more reason to call him God, than they had any of their Deities. And he uses some such Expressions and Arguments, as, if he had gone no further, might seem not altogether inconsistent with the *Arian* Scheme. But I am pretty sure, in some Places, he says those things of our Blessed Saviour, that are utterly inconsistent with it.

Ed. Lugduni, 1651. p. 24. *Cum vero Deus sit certa & sine ullius rei dubitationis ambiguo, inficiaturos arbitramini nos esse, quam maxime illum à nobis coli?*

But when he (*i. e.* Christ) is certainly and without all Possibility of doubting, God, do you think we will deny, that he is worshipped by us with the highest Worship?

He

He had spoke before of the Reasons why, tho' he had been but a Man, as the *Gentiles* objected, yet he might with good reason, in a Sense (which might have suited well enough with the Doctrine of the *Arians*, and other Hereticks) be called God. But he here speaks, *ad rem*, and as home as he could well express himself in any Words, That he is certainly, and without all peradventure, God. And certainly he must mean God in a proper Sense, and one that is truly and by Nature God; for he had spoke before of his being only called God.

And this farther appears from what he saith just after, *Deus ille sublimis fuit, &c.* He was the High God.

*Lactantius*, when he wrote, is acknowledged not to be well instructed in the Christian Doctrine. And therefore *St. Jerome* commends him rather for the *Elegancy of his Style*, than for his *Knowledge in Religion*: And he is counted by some rather a Scholastick, than an Ecclesiastick Writer. And indeed we find many odd things in his Works. But still it may appear, that he was not wholly unacquainted with the true Doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour.

*Lib. 4. cap. 29.* Proposing the Objection of the Christians having Two Gods. He answers:

*When we speak of God the Father, and God the Son, we do not speak of 'em as different, nor do we separate 'em from one another; for neither can the Father be without the Son, nor the Son be separated from the Father. — There is One Mind, One Spirit, One Substance, to both: But the one as a flowing Fountain, the other as a Stream running out of it: The one as the Sun, the other as a Ray, darted from the Sun; who, because faithful and dear to his Great Father, is not separated from him, as neither is the River from the Fountain, nor the Ray from the Sun.*

Here *Lactantius* uses much the same Similitudes, that the other Fathers do, concerning the Trinity;

which are not exact Representations (and therefore are not, as by some they are, to be too strictly canvassed) but as faint Resemblances of that which cannot be truly expressed, nor understood.

I have now done with the *Antenicene* Fathers; and, I think, I have proved they are not so much for the *Arian* Scheme, as Mr. *Whiston* would make us believe. I will not pretend to defend all the Fathers have said of the Trinity. A fair and equitable Judge, will distinguish between the Doctrine they plainly assert, and, generally speaking, they all agree in, and the Explications they give, and the Expressions they sometimes use, which, perhaps, sometimes may not be laid down with so much Caution as they ought to be. The short Limits I intend to set to this Book, will not permit me to answer what *Sandius*, the anonymous Author of the *Irenicum Irenicorum*, and Mr. *Whiston* have objected, as to the Judgment of these *Antenicene* Fathers. And indeed it would not be of much use to the unlearned *English* Readers (for whom especially I design this Collection;) and the learned may consult that excellent Writer Bishop *Bull*, who has all along subjoyn'd to his Citations, an Answer to *Sandius*, the *Irenicum*, *Petavius*, *Huetius*, and others. And, I think, Mr. *Whiston* has not advanced much, but what they have said before him. However, I hope, some one or other will be found (notwithstanding it may be thought a long and tedious Work to meddle with so much impertinent Stuff) to trace his Steps, and follow him in his own tedious Way, and to disprove his Positions (which is easy to do) out of his own Book. There is one invincible Prejudice against Mr. *Whiston's* Scheme. That there is not one of the *Antenicene* Fathers (so far as I can yet see) that ever have distinguish'd of the Names, God, *Logos*, &c. or said the least Word to let us see they took 'em in any other than the proper and ordinary Sense: Nor have they, in any one Place, given the least Hint, that when they call the *Logos* God, they mean only a God by Office



*Office and Appointment*, and not one that is *really God*. And sure it is hard to think when they call Christ God, in so many hundred Places as they do, they should never explain themselves in the *Arian* Sense.

I suppose Mr. *Whiston* will not take it well, I have not placed his Constitutions in the Front of the *Antenice* Fathers; but I cannot help that. I have read his Book both before, and since it was printed, and whether it be want of Proof in him, or it be Prejudice in me, but so it is; I cannot believe it older than that time he himself owns it first appear'd, the Middle of the Fourth Century: And I am still very apt to think it was begotten, not long before it was brought forth. But to think that it should be an apostolical Book, and an authentick Part of Scripture, is absurd, and almost ridiculous. I cannot believe either that God would have caused a Book so written to be concealed from his Church; or that the Apostles, if they had (or *Clemens* by their Order) caused such a Book to be made, would have made it a *disciplina Arcani*, and left it only in the Keeping of the Bishops. I cannot believe but it was much better for the Bishops and the Church too, it should be published at first, when it was written: This would have shewn their Power, and better have taught the People the Obedience due to 'em.

Neither can I believe it possible that such an authentick Book should be committed to the Bishops of nineteen apostolical Churches, and be kept secret by them and all their Successors for near four hundred Years: So far that Mr. *Whiston* cannot clearly prove it so much as mentioned before the Fourth Century.

Neither can I believe but it must have been mention'd and applied to either in the Controversy between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church about *Easter*, or in that about Re-baptization of Hereticks in the *African* Church: Both which are so plainly determin'd in the Constitutions, that that Author writes as plain and point blank on one side, as if he had been a Party Man

in those Disputes; or if the Constitutions are so much *Arian* as Mr. *Whiston* thinks, sure *Eusebius*, who was Bishop of one of those Apostolical Churches, and must have this supposed Sacred Book in his keeping, needed not to have been so wavering as he was at the Council of *Nice*, but might easily have determin'd himself on the *Arian* Side; and, by pleading this Sacred Book, have convinced or shamed the other Party. And as *Eusebius* must have been a Fool, so those many Bishops of the Apostolical Churches, who likewise must have the same Book in their keeping, must have been something I will not name, who, when they knew they had a Sacred Book that determin'd this Controversy against them, durst carry their Cause against it.

All that Mr. *Whiston* can say in this Case must be, that the Book contained a *disciplina Arcani*, and they durst not discover it. This is *gratis dictum*, without one Word of Proof. But supposing it to be so, sure they should have directed their own Opinions in the Council according to it. I wonder what use the Book was of, if it was to be no direction to them in Doctrine or Discipline; or indeed, what it would signify to them, or to the Church, if they might not tell the World there was such a Book, and that their Opinions were grounded upon it. Now for all that Mr. *Whiston* has said or can say against it, I cannot but think it much more likely, not only from the foregoing Reasons, but from many Signatures that plainly appear in the Book it self, that it was made in the Fourth, than in the First Century. And that when Mr. *Whiston* pretends to prove it antient from the Agreement of antient Authors with it, he has only argued just the wrong way, and has made it highly probable that those Places in the Constitutions were cited from those Authors, or refer to them, and that 'tis only a Compilation or a Compendium of such Points of Doctrine, and such Parts of the Discipline of the antient Church (with it may be some Additions of his own) as were approved by that Author.

But

But to wave the Argument at present, I shall be so civil to Mr. *Whiston's* Constitutions, as to allow them a Place among my *Antenicene* Fathers, and faithfully, at large, put down what I can find in them either for or against him or me.

The Edition I make use of, is that of *Paris*, 1618.

Lib. 2. cap. 24. pag. 850. Speaking to the Bishop, he saith, But if he shall be so unmerciful as not to receive him that repenteth, he will sin against the Lord his God, pretending to be more righteous than he, and not receiving him whom he hath received through Christ; for whom he sent his Son, as Man, to Men; for whom he was pleased he should be born of a Woman, who was the Maker both of Man and Woman; for whose sake he spared him not from the Cross, and Death, and Burial, but permitted him to suffer, who was by Nature impassible, ὁ τῆ φύσεως ἀπαθὴς, him who was his beloved Son, who was God the Logos (Word) ὁ Θεὸν Λόγον, him that was the Angel (Messenger) of his Great Counsel, that he might deliver from Death them that were subject to Death: Him they provoke, who do not receive them that repent.

I insist not here on Christ's being said to be the Maker of Man and Woman, because the *Arians* pretend to believe him a Creator, and yet will not allow him to be very God: Tho' if Creation of a World, be not a peculiar Work of the true God, I know not what is.

He is here said to be τῆ φύσεως ἀπαθὴς, which cannot agree to the *Arian* Λόγος, whom they own to be passible, and to have actually suffer'd in our Saviour.

He here calls him ὁ Θεὸν Λόγον, with the Article, by which, I believe, he means very God, tho' Mr. *Whiston* does not.

And ὁ τῆ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελον, which does not here signify one that is an Angel by Nature, but the Messenger of his Great Counsel.

And a little after, speaking of the Woman that was accused of Adultery before our Saviour, he saith,

The



*The Lord, (i. e. Christ) who knows the Heart (ὁ ὢ καρδιοσκεπής) inquiring of her whether the Elders had condemn'd her, &c.*

I know Mr. Whiston will say, Christ knew the Heart, i. e. by Revelation, when and as far as he had occasion for it. But, I think, καρδιοσκεπής intimates something more, and is here laid down as a Property belonging to our Saviour; and if this be an Attribute peculiar to God, it must prove him very God.

And a little after: *This, our Saviour! our King! and our God! O Bishops, ye ought to have as your Mark, i. e. your Pattern, and to be Followers of him, &c.*

Sure if this Author had meant him God, in Mr. Whiston's Sense, he needed not have added (and our God;) for every Body knows that Christ, as he is our Saviour, our King, is our God too in Mr. Whiston's Sense.—*Our God*; this looks too big for a God by Office. Let Mr. W. tell us where any of his Gods by Office are in Scripture, or Fathers, called our God (one Example if he can) as Christ is in hundreds of Places in the Fathers.

Lib. 2. cap. 55. *God (saith he) being a merciful God (ὁ ὢ Θεός, Θεός ὡν ἐλέος) called every Generation to Repentance, by righteous Men and Prophets: Before the Flood by Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah; After the Flood, by Lot, Melchisedech, Job; The Israelites, by Moses, Joshua, Caleb, Phineas; Those after the Law given, by Angels and Prophets. The same he called by his own becoming Man, being born of a Virgin; those a little before his bodily Appearance, by his Forerunner John. The same he called by himself, even after his being born, saying, Repent, &c. Those after his Passion, by us the Twelve, and the chosen Vessel Paul, who having the Honour to be Witnesses of his coming, with James, the Seventy, and the Seven Deacons, we heard from the Mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ; and knowing it exactly, we tell you what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect thing, by Jesus made known to us, that none might perish, but that all Men, with one Consent, believing on him, might live for ever, sending up joint Praises to him.* All

All this is certainly meant of God the Son, who is called in the first Words, ὁ Θεός, Θεός ὡν ἐλέος, *God, the God of Mercy*. And after, the same God of Mercy, is said to call Men, by his own becoming Man, and preaching to the World: And, in the End of the Chapter, those that believe on him, are said, in that Eternal Life they have by him, *to live for ever, sending up joint Praises to him, i. e. to the same God of Mercy, that became Man for their sakes.*

The Opinion of the *Arians* is, that the *Logos* shall deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father, and then certainly it will not be the Business of those that live that happy Life Eternal, to offer up their joint Praises to the *Logos*, but to God. We think the Kingdom to be deliver'd up is the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ, of which there will be no use when the End of it is accomplish'd: And consequently the Praises of Heaven will not then be offer'd up to Christ as Mediator, but to Christ, as God, with God the Father. But it is plainly the Opinion of this Author, that Eternal Praises shall be offer'd up to Christ, *the God of Mercy, that became Man; and so he must think, that God of Mercy, that became Man, is very God.*

Lib. 3. cap. 7. Speaking of the poor Widow that cast in Two Mites into the Treasury, he saith, *But Christ that knows the Hearts, our Lord and Master, when he saw her, &c.* Χεῖρς δὲ ὁ καρδιογνώστης.

Lib. 3. cap. 17. *The Father is God over all, Christ is the only begotten God, μονογενὴς Θεός, the beloved Son, the Lord of Glory, and the Holy Ghost, is the Paraclet sent by Christ, &c.*

Lib. 3. cap. 19. *Christ is, ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς γῆς, the Lord of Heaven and Earth.*

Lib. 5. cap. 12. Among other Days he recommends to Christians, *That the Day of the Epiphany should be had in very great Honour, καθ' ἣν ἀνέδειξεν ὑμῖν τὸ ὁμολογούμενον θεῖον ἐπιφανισμόν, in which he made to you the Manifestation of his proper Divinity.*

I cannot believe but that, *ὁμολογῶν*, is to be so translated, and not by (his Divinity.) And, I think, these Words plainly signify this Author thought Christ to be *truly God*, and not *only God*, by Office and Appointment.

Lib. 1. in the Preface. *And be pleasing in all things to Christ, our God, Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν*; for if any one follow after Iniquity, and do things contrary to the Will of God, he shall be esteemed by God as a disobedient Heathen. Here our Saviour is three times in the same Sentence called God; which one would think should be in a proper Sense. For we never find any God by Office, that is commonly, and upon all occasions, called God, as our Saviour is by the *Antenicene* Fathers. And *Irenæus* somewhere observes (and it is very true) that the Name of God is never given to any in a metaphorical Sense, but that it is plain at first sight that it is so used.

Lib. 5. cap. 14. Speaking of the Jews, he saith, *That when they saw Jesus, they did not believe him to be the Christ of God, begotten of himself before all Ages, the only begotten Son, God the Logos (Word) whom through their unbelief they did not know, either by his mighty Works, or by those Prophecies that were written of him; for that he was to be born of a Virgin, they might read Isa. 7. Behold a Virgin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his Name Immanuel. And, Isaiah 9. unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, whose Government shall be upon his Shoulder, and his Name shall be called the Angel (Messenger) of the Great Counsel, the Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, one that hath all Power and Authority, (εἰρηναῖος) the Prince of Peace, the Father of the World to come, καὶ μᾶλλον αὐτῷ.*

I confess the *Arians* believe Christ to be God, i. e. a God by Office and Appointment of God, as any Angel or Man may be, that hath any Power or Authority committed to him by God. They believe Christ to be begotten of God before all Ages, i. e. made or created by



by him a little before the World; for with them creating and begetting are the same thing, and *before all Ages* is just before the World. They believe him to be *the only begotten Son*, i. e. one immediately created by God the Father, without any Instrument: Whereas God made all other things by the *Logos*, a created Being, and appointed a God. And I know they will wrest all these Expressions to the foregoing Sense. I call it *wresting*, because I think it a great Force put upon the Expressions themselves. But there is no help for it, so Mr. *Whiston* and his Friends will have it.

However, I cannot but think this Author meant all these in an Orthodox Sense, when he cites the 7th and 9th of *Isaiah*, to prove his Opinion; where (as we see before) there are such Epithets and Attributes given to Christ, as cannot possibly agree to any Creature, or any one that is God, only by *Office and Appointment*. Here we may observe two things.

*First*, That this Author is writing to convince the *Jews*. There was no need to convince them that the *Messiah* was to be a God by Appointment. Therefore it is probable he meant the foregoing Expressions in a proper Sense.

*Secondly*, There is hardly one of the *Antenicene* Fathers, but have cited these very Places of *Isaiah*, to prove the real and proper Divinity of Christ. And if this Author do not take them in that Sense, methinks he should explain himself, either here or somewhere in his Book, in what Sense he takes the Word *God*, *Logos*, *only begotten Son*, and the like; which I cannot find he has done.

*Lib. 6. cap. 6.* Among other Hereticks, he reckons the *Ebionites*, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου ἢ βαλόμενος ἐκ ἡδονῆς ἀνδρὸς καὶ συμπλοκῆς Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας αὐτὸν γεννώσας, who thought the Son of God to be only a Man, and allow'd him no other Generation than from *Joseph* and *Mary*.

Does any one think the *Ebionites* so foolish as to deny our Saviour a Metaphorical Divinity, when they own'd him to be the Christ? Therefore this Author must count them Hereticks for denying the real Divinity of Christ our Saviour. And so this Author must think Christ to be really God. 'Tis true, the *Ebionites* did not think him created before the World, nor to have any Being before his Incarnation: But that is nothing to the Matter. For the created *Logos* of Mr. *W.* is no more very God, than if he had no Existence at all before his Incarnation. He might indeed be a more excellent Man (if he could, upon his Supposition, be Man at all) as having a more excellent Soul.

*Lib. 6. cap. 26.* He saith, of having the Holy Spirit, τὸ πνεῦμα ἔχει πάντως ἀχώριστον ἀτε μὴ ἐν τόῳ ἐν, *Thou hast the Holy Ghost altogether inseparable, as being not in any Place, i. e. not confin'd to any Place.*

Here is a plain Assertion of the Ubiquity, and consequently of the true Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

*Lib. 3. cap. 17.* *The Father is God over all, Christ is, μονογενὴς Θεός, the only begotten God, the beloved Son, the Lord of Glory, the Holy Ghost is the Paraclet, &c.*

Methinks, if this Author had not thought Christ really God, he might as well here, and in many other places, have called him the only begotten Son, as the only begotten God. But one would guess he thought, that to call him the Son of God, in a proper Sense, and to call him God, is one and the same thing.

*Lib. 6. cap. 11.* *But we, who preach the true Doctrine of Religion, profess only One God, the Lord of the Law and Prophets, the Maker of all Things, the Father of Christ, &c.—The God and Father of the only begotten Son, the First Born of the whole Creation, One God, the Father of one Son, not many, and of one*

*Para-*

*Paraclet; by Christ the Maker of all other Orders of Beings.*

If this Author were *Arian*, 'tis a wonder to me he should not here, or some where, tell us; but still so nicely distinguish between the Original of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, and the rest of the World: Call God the Maker of all Beings, but the Father of Christ; when, by the *Arian* Scheme, there was no difference, but that God made the *Logos* first and alone, but other things by the Assistance of that noble Creature. He tells us he is the Father of *one Son*, not many, as if it were impossible there should be any more such Sons: Whereas (if the *Arians* be right) God may create as many such Sons as he pleases.

And, in the End of this Chapter—*We confess Christ to be not a meer Man (ὁ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου) but God the Word, and Man the Mediator between God and Men.*

Here God is opposed to Man; and if this Author thought Christ very Man, he must sure think him very God: He is God and Man, and therefore must have an human Soul, besides his Divinity.

*Lib. 6. cap. 25.* He speaks of the Hereticks—Some denied him (Christ) to be properly the Son of God, and his Generation, *αὐτὸς ἔτι ἀιώνος*, before all Ages, least they should own him to be God: Others thought him no more than Man, because they could not think how he, that appeared every way as Man, should be God: Others thought he must be God, and therefore was only in appearance a Man: Others, that he was the One God, only under the different Denomination of the Redeemer. All these Hereticks certainly meant by God, a God by Nature. God by Office and Appointment, never came into question, was never denied by any of those that denied Christ to be God. And therefore this Author, when



he censures these Hereticks for denying Christ to be God, must mean, by the Word *God*, him that is *very God*; and one would think could not be an *Arian*.

Lib. 7. cap. 27. *Who hast sent on Earth Jesus thy Christ, that, as Man, he might converse with Men, being God, the Logos (Word) and Man, Θεὸν ὄντα Λόγον καὶ ἄνθρωπον.*

Here God, the Word, is contradistinguish'd from Man; and therefore, in reason, Christ must be very God, as well as very Man. God, the Word, did not, as the *Arians* suppose, make up a part of his Manhood, by being the Soul of the Man Christ Jesus.

And to the same Purpose, Lib. 7. cap. 27. *That we may come to the remembrance (be put in mind of) that Wisdom which was created by thee, ἡ σοφία ἡ ἀνάρχου σοφίας, how for our sakes he submitted to be born of a Virgin, appear'd in this Life, shewing himself at his Baptism, that he was both God and Man.*

I think this is the only place in these Constitutions where this Word, *σοφία*, created, is applied to our Saviour. Mr. W. makes a great Noise with it in his Book, and with the Fathers, who cited that Place, *Prov. 8.* Tho' the Fathers, many of them that cited it, understood not the *Hebrew* Language, yet Mr. W. I doubt not does. And if they did not, he might understand that the *Hebrew* Word, *Prov. 8.* does not signify to *make or create*, but to *acquire, have a right to, or possess*. And therefore we translate it, *The Lord possessed me in the Beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old.* But, I suppose, rather than lose such an Argument to make a Noise with to no purpose, he will shortly assert the *Septuagint* Translation is as much better than the *Hebrew* Text, as his Constitutions are, in his Opinion, better than the *New Testament*.

Lib. 7. cap. 40. This Author advises that the *Catechumens*, before their Baptism, should be well instructed in the Knowledge, *οὗ καὶ ἀγεννῆς, καὶ οὗ μωρογενῆς, καὶ οὗ ἀγίου πνεύματος*, concerning the unbegotten God, concerning the only begotten Son, and concerning the Holy Ghost.

If Mr. W. were to instruct the *Catechumens*, I have a shrewd guess how he would explain this Trinity. But, I hope, this Author is unjustly charg'd with *Arianism*, and understood these Words in an Orthodox Sense.

Lib. 7. cap. 42. He recites the Baptismal Creed :

*I believe in the only unbegotten true God Almighty, the Father of Christ, the Creator and Maker of all things, from whom are all things; and in our Lord Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, the First Born of every Creature (of the whole Creation) who was before all Ages, by the good Will of the Father, begotten, not created (γεννηθεῖς καὶ κτισθεῖς) by whom were made all things, both things in Heaven, and things on Earth, both visible and invisible.*

Tho' Mr. Whiston will not allow these Words (*καὶ κτισθεῖς*, not made or created) a place in his Text, he cannot deny that they are in many Copies, and that they have been printed in the Text in several Editions. If he had been never so sure then of their being interpolated, he might have put 'em within his Brackets, that he keeps for Interpolations. But it must not be known forsooth that they were ever printed in the Text, but are only a various reading, and convenient to be kept from the English Reader; for if they be genuine, they cut the Throat of Mr. Whiston's Cause. And truly, I do not see why they may not be so, when this Author always distinguishes between the Generation of Christ, and the Creation of other things, by using different Words, and never once uses the Word *γεννηθεῖς* as to the Creatures, nor the Word *κτισμα*

*ἡσίου ἡλίου*, or *ἡμμεσίου*, concerning Christ. And since, by Mr. Whiston's Confession, these Constitutions did not appear till a good while after the Council of Nice; and since, we cannot but think it very probable, they were compiled not long before they came out; I cannot see this Author is so much *Arian*, but he might put into his pretended Constitutions this Expression, the very Words of that Council; and that it is as likely that the *Arians* might strike, & *ἡσίου*, out of some Copies, as that the Orthodox should put it into others.

*Lib. 7. cap. 44.* In the Beginning of the Chapter, that contains the Consecration of the Baptismal Water, there are these Words:

After that, he (i.e. the Priest) blesses and praises the Lord God Omnipotent, the Father of the only begotten God (i.e. Christ) giving him thanks that he hath sent his Son to be made Man for us, that he might save us; that he permitted that being made Man, he should be obedient in all things; that he should preach the Kingdom of Heaven, the Remission of Sins, and the Resurrection from the Dead.

After that he worships the only begotten God himself. After him, and by him, giving thanks to him, that he took upon him to die for all Men upon the Cross, as a Type of which he appointed the Baptism of Regeneration, &c. And,

*Lib. 8. cap. 7.* In the Prayer for the *Energumēni*, those that are possessed, Christ is directly and primarily pray'd to.

O thou only begotten God, thou Son of the Great Father, rebuke these wicked Spirits, and deliver the Works of thy Hands, from the Power (Energy) of the adverse (strange) Spirit. Now to thee be Glory, Honour, and Worship, and by thee to thy Father, in the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever, Amen.

Here we see plainly that Solemn and Religious Worship, is, and may be given directly, and particularly,



cularly, to the *μονογενὴς Θεός*, the only begotten God, Christ Jesus; and that by himself without mentioning God the Father. And the Doxology here is directed immediately to God the Son. And as none can think when we thus directly worship the Son we exclude the Father; so neither, when we apply our Worship immediately to the Father, do we exclude the Son. There being certainly some such (tho' incomprehensible and ineffable) Union between the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, as makes them the one and only Object of Religious Worship.

Nor does the Author, or (as far as I can find) any of the *Antenicene* Fathers, make any Distinction of an inferiour Sort of Worship due to the Son, and different from that due to the Father. But, in many Places, the Fathers argue from Divine Worship being to be given to the Son, that he must needs be God. They lay it down as a Rule, a Kind of Principle and Postulatum in Divinity, that none is to be worshipped but he that is truly God. And indeed, with very good reason, for Solemn, Religious Worship, is nothing but the Solemn Acknowledgments we pay to God, by Praising of him, and Praying, and giving Thanks to him. The Patrons therefore, and Defenders of the Worship of Angels, and canonized Saints, are mightily beholding to the *Arians*, who, by introducing the Distinction of an inferiour Sort of Worship due to the Son, and a yet lower Degree to the Holy Ghost (something like the *Latria*, *Hyperdulia* and *Dulia* of the Papists) first opened a wide Door to that gross Idolatry that once almost overspread the Church of Christ.

Nor should the directing our Solemn, Religious Worship (as we generally do) immediately to God the Father, be used as an Argument, to prove that we are not to worship the Son at all, or are to do it with an inferiour Kind of Worship.

When

When we direct our Worship to God absolutely, without considering the Distinction of Persons in the Godhead, we mean Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the One God of the Christians; and we pray to be accepted through Jesus Christ, who tho' he be as God, the Second Person in the Trinity, yet is then consider'd as *God Man*, the Mediator between God and Man.

When we direct our Prayers, Praises, and Thanksgivings, to God the Father, it is no Derogation from the Son and Holy Ghost; and being he is the first Person in the Trinity, it seems most fit that he should represent the whole Trinity, especially when the Son and Holy Ghost have their peculiar and distinct Offices; the one as Mediator between God and Man, the other as the Sanctifier of Believers.

If any one shall say, the Father is the first Person in the Trinity, and therefore is to be worshipped with the chief Worship? I Answer, If they mean by Worship the Acknowledgments that are due to God, as God; if the Son and Holy Ghost are truly God, as we believe they are, the same Acknowledgments are due to them: And therefore they are to be worshipped with the same Kind of Worship. If they mean by Worship the Solemn Acknowledgment of some Kind of Superiority in the Father, as the Son is from him, and will call this an higher Kind of Worship, and that be all they mean, and do not mean the Son to be excluded from being worshipped as truly God, I see no harm in granting it. The Fathers generally, both before and after the Council of *Nice*, acknowledged some Kind of Superiority of the Father above the Son, as he was the first Person in the Trinity, and so of the Son with respect to the Holy Ghost. And what we may believe of the Order, or (as the Fathers call it) the Oeconomy of the Blessed Trinity, we may solemnly acknowledge in our Worship: But I do

do not think this needs be called an higher Degree of Worship.

*Lib. 8. cap. 12.* In the Prayer for the Penitents he hath these Words: *Restore them to thy Holy Church with their former Dignity and Honour, through Christ our God and Saviour,* δια Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

*Lib. 8. cap. 11.* In the Prayer for the Faithful: *Vouchsafe to give them that Eternal Life, which is in Christ, thy only begotten Son, our God and Saviour.*

*Lib. 8. cap. 12.* *And Holy is thy only begotten Son our Lord and God Jesus Christ.*

And a little after, speaking of our Saviour, ὁ ἀρχαῖος γεννηθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ γεγέννητο, *He that was begotten before all time, was also begotten in time.*

These Words, if they signify any thing, must denote the Eternity of the Son of God, to be begotten without time, must signify to be begotten before time, *i. e.* from Eternity; or else the Antithesis, between the two Parts of the Sentence, would be nothing. And if he meant that the *Logos* was begotten only a little before the Creation, he might as well have said, ὁ ἐν χρόνῳ γεννηθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ γεγέννητο, *He that was begotten in time, was begotten in time.* A very wise Saying! And yet so it must be; for if the Divine Nature of Christ the *Logos* was begotten only a little before the World, it was as certainly begotten in time (tho' a great while before), as his Human Nature was in the Womb of the Virgin.

*Ibid.* αὐτὸς ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀθάνατος ὁ τῇ φύσει ἀθάνατος, *He who is impassible was nailed to a Cross, and he died who is by Nature Immortal.*

This is plainly against the *Arians*, who believed the Divine Nature of Christ to be passible, and actually to have suffered in our Saviour. By these Words, *by Nature Immortal*, I suppose, he means of such a Nature that it is impossible he should die; and



if so, it is directly against the *Arians*, who did not believe their *Logos Immutable and Immortal* by an *absolute Necessity of Nature*, but only Immortal by the Will of God, as we believe the Souls of Men are; which, tho' it is not absolutely impossible but they might die, or cease to be, yet it is the Will of God, their Creator, that they shall live for ever.

In the End of this Chapter the Doxology is remarkable.

Ὅτι σοὶ πάντα δόξα, σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, &c.

*To thee, the Father, be all Glory, Worship and Thanksgiving; Honour and Adoration, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.*

*And, cap. 16. with whom (that is Christ) to thee be Glory, Honour and Worship, and to the Holy Ghost for ever, Amen.*

And this last Form of Doxology we find in Chapter 18, 20, 21, 22, 37, 38, 39: So that our very Form of Doxology, or what is equivalent, is no less than nine times, I might say ten; for there is the same Form once before in these very Constitutions.

It is well if Mr. *Whiston* can give a good Account why, in his Edition of these Constitutions, he alters this Form so often repeated, and puts (*διὰ by*, and *ἐν in*) into the Text, and thrusts (*συν with*, and *καὶ and*) into the Margin. But the Constitutions are his own, he may do what he will with them. Nor ought any one to wonder at it, when he has formerly made as bold with the New Testament it self: Only this Interpolation (for 'tis no better) is made meerly of his own hot Head, without the Authority of any Manuscript or Printed Copy; because, forsooth, there are some Doxologies in these Constitutions that run in another Form, and he has taken up a groundless Fancy (or pre-

tends

tends so at least) that all the antient Doxologies ran otherwise. In which he is much mistaken; for there are certainly Instances of Doxologies, in the same Form with ours, long before the Council of *Nice*: Not to insist upon the later Liturgies, particularly *Polycarp*, gives Glory to God, by Christ, and with Christ, which shews the Two Forms of Doxology, are not inconsistent with one another. And it is not improbable the *Arians* first scrupled and altered the other Form, to that which Mr. *Whiston* likes so well. However, I do not see how Mr. *Whiston* will make any great Earnings of it; for our giving Glory to God, the Father, by the Son, may as well consist with our asserting the Divinity of our Saviour, as the saying *through Jesus Christ our Lord*, at the End of our Prayers.

And now, upon the whole, I cannot see that these Constitutions are so much for Mr. *W.* as he and others suppose 'em to be. I think I have cited a great many Passages that are direct and full against the *Arian* Opinions. And for those Expressions, that are common to the *Orthodox*, and the *Arians*, only in a different Sense, such as *God, the Logos (Word) the only begotten Son, &c.* I can see nothing in these whole Constitutions that makes it plain the Author understood 'em in an *Arian* Sense. And I find a great many Passages, that do absolutely require, if the Author will be consistent with himself, that he should mean 'em in the Sense of the *Orthodox*; and, if he do not, he certainly contradicts himself. If a Man can be thought, when he calls Christ God an hundred times, to mean only a God by Appointment, a Creature, and not one that hath any thing of the Nature of God, when he, in one Place or other, ascribes to him almost all the essential Attributes of God? If a Man must be supposed (when he makes the nicest Distinction between *begetting* and *creating*, applying the

the one to Christ, the other to other things, without ever varying) to think *begetting and creating* the same Thing (I might give more Instances) I say if this be so, 'tis to no Purpose to use any Words to express our Sentiments.

I have look'd over these Constitutions with the best Care I can, and I own I find little or nothing, but what is very capable of an Orthodox Sense.

The most suspicious Passages I can find are Two to the same Purpose, and I will here lay 'em before the Reader; they are both much the same.

The one is in the Baptismal Creed, *Lib. 7. Cap. 42.* where speaking some things we believe of our Saviour; he hath these Words, *καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων, εὐδοκία τῷ πατρὶς γεννηθέντα ἢ κτισθέντα*, *he that was before the Ages (the World) by the good Will (good Pleasure) of the Father, begotten not created.*

The other Passage to the same Purpose, is, *Lib. 8. Cap. 12.* *Αὐτὸν δὲ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων γεννήσας, βολήσας καὶ δυνάμει καὶ ἀγαθότητι ἀμεσιτέυτως, υἱὸν μονογενῆ, &c.* *Having begotten him the only begotten Son, before all Ages by his Will, and Power, and Goodness, without the Mediation of any Instrument.* The *Arians* contend that the Generation of the Son was a meer voluntary act in God, that it depended intirely upon his Pleasure, whether the Son should be or not.

And I will not deny, but these Passages may seem to look toward that Opinion. But,

This Author here plainly distinguishes between *Generation and Creation*. Having said just before, *Thou who broughtest all Things out of nothing, into Being, by thine only begotten Son, having begotten him before all Ages by thy Will, &c.* Now what Reason can be given, why this Author should make such a Distinction in Words, when there is no difference in the Thing, and yet this is constantly observed by him, and by all the Fathers. Could he not as well have said, *Thou that broughtest all Things into Being out of nothing, by thy only begot-*



*begotten Son, having before all Ages brought him out of nothing into Being, by thy Will, and Power, and Goodness, immediately without any Instrument.*

2. If this Generation of the Son intirely depend on the meer Will of God, how many such Sons will the *Arians* say, God may beget if he please. The *Logos* is every where stiled the only begotten Son, both in Scripture and the Fathers. Which I am apt to think not only signifies, that he is the only Son that he has begotten, but that he can beget by such a Generation. But there is no need of this Answer.

3. I say, we must distinguish of Things that may be done, some are of such a Nature that God may will, or not will 'em as he pleases. Some such as he cannot will them at all. And some such as he cannot but will them. He cannot but will all his Essential and Divine Perfections. Whatever necessarily follows from the Essential Properties of his Nature, must be the Object of his Will. Tho' we should suppose this Generation of the Son of God to be Eternal, I see no reason, why we may not say as this Author does in one Place, that it is *τη ευδοκία* by his good Pleasure, and in the other *τη βολή* by his Will, as well as we may say that he is, by his Will, Holy, Just, and Good. Or that he does some Things, which are so absolutely Good and the best, so agreeable to his Nature that he cannot but do 'em, and yet does 'em by his Will, and Power, and Goodness. Neither does the Expression imply, that God might will otherwise. If a Trinity, be essential to the Deity, it is no less essential to his Nature to will the Generation of his Son.

I know Mr. *W.* will not allow this reasoning, and he will call it Metaphysical, for that's a great Word with him, when he has a mind to hide himself, that no Body may know where he is, or what he means. *Metaphysical Eternity, Metaphysical Essence, &c.* which I think are but *Physical Bulls, or Physical Nonsense.*

I say, if he be resolved this Author shall be *Arian*, on account of these Two Expressions, let him make his best of 'em. I profess these are all I can find, that bring him under any Suspicion. He never explains the Words, Θεός, λόγος, μονογενής, in an *Arian* Sense; he never says, that *Generation and Creation* are the same; he never says there was a Time when the Father was without his Son, and the Son was not. He never says the Son is a Creature, but as constantly distinguishes the Generation of the Son, from the Creation of other Things, by keeping close to his Terms, even when he has Occasion to mention both together, and set 'em in direct Opposition, as any *Trinitarian* can do. And he says, in Twenty Places things utterly inconsistent with the *Arian* Scheme.

But hold (will Mr. *Whiston* say) not too fast. Do not the Constitutions cite *Prov.* 8. and apply it to the Son of God, where it is ἐκτίσε με, he made or created me, Yes. But does he insist upon that Place, to prove the Son properly speaking a Creature? No by no means. Nor the *Antenice* Fathers neither. Tho' they often mention it, yet they as constantly keep to the Terms of *Generation* for the Son, and *Creation* for other Things, and as much distinguish the one from the other, as if there had been no such Place in the Bible. And if they had understood the *Hebrew* Language, as well as they did the *Greek*, they and this Author too, would no doubt have seen how little reason there was to insist upon it. No 'twas the *Arians* afterwards (as Mr. *Whiston* does now) that made a great Noise with it, because they were at great want of Arguments to support their Novel Doctrine. And sorry ones were better than none at all.

'Tis no great wonder the Fathers (when they have no occasion for Nicety) should not always strictly distinguish γέννητος *factus* made, and γέννητος *genitus*

thus begotten, when they differ but in one poor Letter, tho' their true and proper Signification be very different, the one coming from *γίνομαι*, *gino*, to be made, the other from *γεννέομαι*, *gigno*, to beget. Suppose it should sometimes so happen, what's this to the Current of their Writings, or to prove that *begetting* and *creating* are the same thing. Suppose it should sometimes happen, that the *Greek* Fathers should use *κτισω* or *κτίσας*, with respect to the Son of God, mislead by that false translated Place in the *Proverbs*: Or the *Latin* Fathers use *Factus* or *Creatus*, it may be mislead by them, when yet they in an hundred Places for one, speak more distinctly and properly, must some few improper Expressions carry it against a whole Stream of Places, where they speak distinctly and properly? No doubt Creation may in a loose and general Sense be called Generation, and God is in this Sense the Father of all his Creatures; and so may Generation be called Creation, and a Father be said to *make* his Son, must we therefore never make any Distinction between them? 'Tis a common Expression in some Countreys to say, they cannot *make a Child*, would it not be ridiculous to argue, that in those Countreys they make their Children with their Hands, as the Women at *Smithfield Exchange* do their *Bartholomew* Babies? I speak not this, that I think there is any great Occasion for it; for I do not remember, I have met with many Places in the *Antenicene* Fathers, where they apply any Word that signifies Creation to the Son of God, except when they cite that Place in the *Proverbs*; and even then to the best of my remembrance, they never argue from it as the *Arians* did afterward to prove him a Creature. However I am sure, Mr. *Whiston's* Constitutions in that place where they cite it, draw no such Consequence from it.

Mr. *Whiston* has indeed in his 4th Book, referr'd us to a good number of Places, ( and in his *Refle-*



ons on Dr. *Clark*, has given the Words) which he thinks clear for the *Creation of the Son*; but I think near one Half of them refer to that Place, *Prov. 8.* spoken of before; some are misapply'd, and many of them taken from such spurious or justly suspected Authors, as are of little Authority with any but Mr. *W.* as may be made out on a more proper Occasion.

But still will Mr. *Whiston* say, do not the Constitutions, in that very Place you have cited, say the Son was begotten by the Father, ἀμειδίτως, immediately and solely by himself, without the Help of any other? Yes; but they say he was begotten too, and plainly distinguish that Generation from the Creation of other things: Whereas, the *Arians* say, he was created ἀμειδίτως. So that still Mr. *Whiston* will want a Place from his Constitutions, to prove the Son a Creature, unless as he and the *Arians* say, That Creation, ἀμειδίτως, without the Help of any Instrument, is Generation; they will say too, That Generation, ἀμειδίτως, without any Help, is Creation. I am apt to think this Author, if he meant what his Expression means, by it designs to distinguish the Generation of the Son of God, from common and ordinary Generation, where there must be Male and Female; or from that, the Heathen supposed, who had their Female Deities. However, it is certain, he says not a Word of any proper Creation, ἀμειδίτως, much less does he say that is the Generation of the *Logos*, or Son of God.

And thus I have gone through my Collections out of the *Antenicene* Fathers; and have given Mr. *Whiston* his Constitutions (tho' after that time) into the Bargain. Much good may they do him; but, if he could make 'em canonical, I believe they would not serve his Cause so much, as some have supposed they do.

Now

Now since the Eternal Existence of the Son of God, is a main Point in which the Orthodox and the *Arians* differ, tho' as I have gone along I have remarked many Places, where it is plainly proved, yet I think it not amiss, to collect 'em here, and set 'em before the Reader in one view. This Eternity of the Son is a Thing Mr. *Whiston* stiffly denies, and thinks to blow all Passages of the Fathers off at one puff, with a fine new Philosophical Term, without any Idea belonging to it. He has found out a rare Secret, a *Metaphysical Eternity*, which he says all the Fathers meant, when they talk of the Eternity of the Son of God. If he mean only, that the Son of God was from Eternity in *Potentia*, that it was possible he might Exist when it pleased his Father, he has made a rare discovery, that will make the World Eternal, and every Thing in it. If he do not mean this, we should be glad to know what he does mean by it. Now I will collect some Places out of the *Antenicene* Fathers, and leave the Reader to judge whether they better agree with the *real actual Eternity* that we assert of the Son of God, or Mr. *Whiston's Potential, Notional*, or as he calls it, *Metaphysical Eternity*.

Before I do this, I would remark one Thing, the reciprocal Agreement between Christ's being God, and his being Eternal; and the necessary Consequence of each from the other. If we can prove him very God, we thereby prove him Eternal; and if we can prove him Eternal, we thereby prove him very God. So that the Testimonies we bring from the Fathers to prove either of these, do prove the other too. He that is truly God must be Physically (more than Metaphysically) Eternal, and he that is Physically Eternal, must be very God. But to begin,

*Ignatius* calls our Saviour, ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντων, ὁ ἀχρονος, one above or beyond, or before Time, one without Time,

I know not what else these Expressions can signifie but a proper Eternity.

And again, in another Place, speaking of our Saviour, he says, he is *αὐτὸς λόγος αἰδίου*, his, (that is God's) *Eternal Word*. I should think *αἰδίου* is the best Word the Greek has to signifie Eternity.

Mr. Whiston indeed says in his Essay on Ignatius's Epistles, it is impossible Ignatius should say so. But that is only one of his bold Assertions; nor do I think there is any Thing in those he supposes to be the genuine Epistles of Ignatius that contradicts it.

Justin Martyr in his Epistle to Diognetus, says, Christ is *ὁ αἰς ὧν*, one that always is. He asserts it was the *Logos*, the Son of God that appeared to Moses at the Bush by the Name *ὁ ὢν*, I am, which being there used Emphatically, and κατ' ἐξοχὴν signifies Necessary or Eternal Existence; and speaking in another Place of our Saviour with respect to God, he says he is *συνὸν καὶ γεννώμενος*, one coexisting with him, and begotten by him.

Ireneus. The Son always coexisting with the Father, did of old, and from the beginning always reveal the Father. And Lib. 3. c. 20. No Body can contradict and say, If therefore Christ was born then, he was not before, for we have shewn, that the Son of God did not then begin to be, being always existing with the Father. And in another Place, giving a reason of the shortness of our Knowledge; he saith, For thou art not, (O Man) an uncreated Being: Neither didst thou always coexist with God, as his proper *Logos* (Word.)

Clemens Alexandrinus: Pag. 74. For this Jesus is Eternal *αἰδίου*, the one great High Priest of the one God, and his Father.

In his Hymn to Christ, he calls him *λόγος αἰωνος*, the Eternal Word, *αἰων ἀπλητος*, the Infinite Age, *φῶς αἰδίου*, the Eternal Light! Strom. 7. in Princ. he calls Christ *ἄχρονος καὶ ἀναρχος*, one without Time or Beginning.



Pag. 703. Neither can Envy touch the impassible Lord, who was without beginning, ἀνάχως γενομένης.

Athanasius cites two Passages of Origen much to our Purpose, but I know not, whether it be to any Purpose to put 'em in, because Mr. W. pretends to have convicted him of Forgery; but I'll venture for once.

Tom. 1. Pag. 277. If he be the Image of the Invisible God, I may dare to add, that he being the likeness of his Father, there never was a Time when he was not, ἐκ εἶν ὅτε ἐκ ἡν.

And a little after, he cites Origen, saying, We must not deprive God as much as in us lies, τὰ αὐτοῦ συνόντ' αὐτῷ λόγῳ μονογενῆς, of his only begotten Logos (Word) that was ever with him. These Passages are so full against Arianism, that Petavius admires that Origen should say so, but there is no great Reason, for the Gnosticks had their ἡν ὅτε ἐκ ἡν long before the Arians.

Cont. Cels. Camb. Ed. pag. 239. He calls Christ ἀπδύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου, the Splendor of the Eternal Light; if the Light be Eternal, the Splendor must be so too.

In Johan. Ed. Huet. pag. 31. There is a famous Passage too long to cite, in which are these Words, There being no beginning of his Generation found, Ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐκ ἐνείστοκομένων.

Socrates, E. H. Lib. 7. c. 6. says, That Origen every where confesses the Son coeternal with the Father.

Pamphilus, in his Apology for Origen, says, That Origen every where asserts, that the Father is not before the Son, that the Son is coeternal with the Father, that the Generation of the Son of God is without any Beginning: If he plead thus for Origen, no doubt, he believed it himself.

Methodius, in Phot. Bib. Cod. 237. upon those Words, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee;

thee; hath these Words, *It is to be observed, that he calls him his Son indefinitely, and without any respect to time, ἀχρόνως*: He says to him, *Thou art my Son, not thou art made my Son; neither declaring that he had obtained a new Filiation, nor that that he had before had any End, but was always the same.*

That which has neither Beginning nor End, must be Eternal: As, I think, I well may gather from this Passage, whether *Methodius* reason'd right from the Text or no. The same Text is so interpreted by many of the Fathers.

The *Antiochene* Fathers, in their Epistle to *P. Samosat.* say of our Saviour, *We believe that he being always with the Father, fulfilled his Father's Will in the Creation of all things.*

*Greg. Thaumaturgus*, in his Confession of Faith, saith of Christ, *That he is the Eternal Image of his Father, the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father*: And says, *The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are a perfect Trinity, undivided in their Glory, Eternity, and Kingdom.* The Greek Words are, αἰδίῳ, and αἰδιότῳ.

*Athanasius*, Tom. i. p. 559. tells us, that the Accusations against *Dionysius of Alexandria* were, *That he had said that God was not always a Father; That the Son was not always; That God was sometime without the Logos; That there was a Time when the Son was not; That he was not Eternal, but was begotten afterwards.*

These he denies, and defends himself from the Accusation: A certain Evidence that the Church then believed the Eternity of the Son.

*Athanasius*, Tom. i. pag. 276. tells us *Dionysius Rom.* said, *It is no ordinary but the greatest Blasphemy, to say the Son was made in any sort, or in any manner a Creature, χεῖρον τοῦ τῶν τελέτων; for if the Son was made, there was a Time when he was not, but he always was*: And this was the Sense not only of *Dionysius Rom.* but of all the Roman Clergy.

St.

St. *Cyprian* says little in express Words of the Eternity of the Son; but he asserts him in so many Places to be very God, that he must be supposed to believe it. And, *Contr. Judeos*, cap. 5. he cites *Apoc.* 21. v. 6, 7. I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the First and the Last, &c. and applies them to the Son: And cannot be supposed, with the *Arians*, to believe, *ἦν ὅτε ἐκ ἡν*, there was a Time when the Son was not.

I might here remark, that we are told by some, that the *Arians* held a double *Logos*: The one they own'd to be Eternal, always in or with God; the other created in Time, and of a distinct Nature from God. But this was one of their shuffling Evasions, when they were resolv'd to keep their Opinion; but willing to be thought to believe with the Orthodox. For, no doubt, by their Eternal *Logos*, they only meant a Quality or Attribute of God his Wisdom, which must be always in God; by the other a Person or Subsistence, which was created by him: This was only a *lusus in terminis*, to put upon the Orthodox.

I might likewise here produce the Testimonies of *Athanagoras*, *Tatian*, *Tertullian*, and others; but because there are in them some Expressions that may seem to render their Testimonies more dubious (tho' it may be fairly proved they were of the same Opinion with other Fathers) I shall content my self with these already produced, being brought out of those Fathers, who wrote most, and are of most Authority.

There is but one thing more I would add, in short, before I conclude; and that is, that the *Antenicene* Fathers were not only of this Opinion, that our Saviour was Very and Eternal God, but they believ'd it to be a necessary Article of the Christian Faith (nay some of them went so far as to exclude those from Hopes of Salvation that did not believe



PRO ARIANISM not the, &c.

believe it.) That they looked upon it as a necessary Part of the Christian Faith, is plain, not only from a Multitude of Expressions that might be produced out of, I think, almost all the *Antient* Fathers, but from their condemning as Hereticks, not only those that denied the Pre-existence of our Saviour, such as *Cerintus*, *Ehion*, &c. but even those that denied the Verity and Eternity of his Godhead, tho' they own'd his Pre-existence. I doubt not but this might easily be made appear, but will be more proper to be done by those that shall undertake to give a full and distinct Answer to Mr. *Whiston's Primitive Christianity revised*, when they come to consider the several Creeds of the ancient Church.

---

FINIS

6 JU 65

